DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 482 HE 001 205

AUTHOR	Howard, Lawrence C., Ed.
TITLE	Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	Wisconsin Univ., Milwaukee. Inst. for Human Relations.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.; Wisconsin Univ., Milwaukee. Inst. for Human Relations.
PUB DATE	67
NOTE	571p.; Proceedings of a Conference on Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education, Wingspread, Racine, Wisconsin, March 3-4, 1967
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$2.25 HC-$28.65
DESCRIPTORS	Administration, Affiliated Schools, Art Education, Bibliographies, Civil Rights, College Cooperation, *Colleges, Governance, *Higher Education, *Interinstitutional Cooperation, *Negro Colleges, Negro Education, Negroes, Social Change, Students, Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*Higher Education Act of 1965 Title III

ABSTRACT

This conference focused attention on the uses of interinstitutional cooperation as a device to strengthen developing institutions of higher education. The 30 contributors included social critics, members of foundations and federal agencies, and representatives of institutions in the Developing Colleges Program. (This program, Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, has financed 249 cooperative arrangements which have either linked a developing college to an established institution or developing colleges to each other.) The proceedings are divided into 7 major topics: 1) Interinstitutional Cooperation for the Established and Developing Colleges; 2) The Nature of Interinstitutional Cooperation; 3) Some Implications of Interinstitutional Cooperation for the Governance of Higher Education; 4) Interinstitutional Cooperation and the College Student; 5) Promoting Change through Interinstitutional Cooperation; 6) Interinstitutional Cooperation and the Future; and 7) Recommendations. The editor includes a commentary in each section and a bibliography in Section 2. He concludes that "interinstitutional cooperation among colleges of different levels of quality works and...should be dramatically expanded." Copies are available from Bureau of Higher Education Research, US Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202. (DS)

ED034482

INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Edited by Lawrence C. Howard

Proceedings of the
Conference
Interinstitutional Cooperation
in Higher Education
Wingspread, Racine, Wisconsin
March 3-4, 1967

Sponsored by the
Institute of Human Relations-
University of Wisconsin
The United States Office of Education
The Danforth Foundation
and The Johnson Foundation

HE001205

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CONTENTS

PREFACE

I INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION FOR THE ESTABLISHED AND DEVELOPING COLLEGES

THE SETTING 1

ACHIEVING ACADEMIC STRENGTH THROUGH INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION: THE VIEW FROM THE UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION 6
Willa B. Player

HOW COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS INVOLVING PREDOMINANTLY NEGRO COLLEGES GOT STARTED 19
Arthur Singer

PROGRAM FOR NEGRO COLLEGES 25
Samuel Nabrit
Stephen White
Jerrold Zacharias

INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION: A PRESIDENT OF A DEVELOPING COLLEGE GIVES AN IN DEPTH VIEW 44
L. H. Pitts

COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS AND THE PREDOMINANTLY NEGRO COLLEGE: A DEAN'S VIEW 61
Hugh M. Gloster

INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION: A PROFESSOR'S WORM'S EYE VIEW 73
Cecil L. Patterson

PERSPECTIVES ON INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION 87

II THE NATURE OF INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

TOWARD A THEORETICAL FOUNDATION 97

SURVEY AND ANALYSIS OF THE LITERATURE RELATED TO INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION .. 101
Lawrence C. Howard

A SYSTEMS APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF THE INTERNAL PROBLEMS AND THE EXTERNAL RELATIONSHIPS OF THE UNIVERSITY 164
Daniel Katz

ANALYZING THE DYNAMICS OF ACADEMIC QUALITY 190
Robert McGinnis

ON LEADERSHIP FOR DEVELOPING COLLEGES 210
Lawrence C. Howard

PERSPECTIVES ON THE NATURE OF INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION 226

III SOME IMPLICATIONS OF INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION FOR THE GOVERNANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION RELATED TO THE MANAGEMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION 237

IMPLICATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATION ARISING FROM THE GROWING INTERDEPENDENCE OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES 241
Algo C. Henderson

ISSUES AND PROBLEMS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF INTER-INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION 254
James C. Messersmith

INTERINSTITUTIONAL EXCHANGE AND MEDIA 264
Gary Gumpert

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE SPIRIT: A CASE STUDY 294
C. M. Charles

COOPERATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION 304
Raymond S. Moore

THE PROBLEM IS EDUCATIONAL POVERTY 325
Fred E. Crossland

PERSPECTIVES ON THE GOVERNANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION 329

IV INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION AND THE COLLEGE STUDENT

THE STUDENT 337

THE STUDENT AND INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION 343
Joseph Katz

THE NEGRO AND EDUCATION: AN EXERCISE IN ABSURDITY... 358
Edward W. Crosby

THE ROLE OF THE ARTS IN EDUCATION 385
Howard Conant

PERSPECTIVES ON STUDENTS 406

V PROMOTING CHANGE THROUGH INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS 414

IS HIGHER EDUCATION READY FOR THE NEGRO? 419
Lawrence C. Howard

IMPROVING COLLEGE PERFORMANCE IN INTEGRATED EDUCATION 435
Doxey A. Wilkerson
Edmund W. Gordon

CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE UNIVERSITY--PHASE II: THE INTEGRATED CAMPUS 452
Lawrence C. Howard
Marc Lee

TRANSFORMING THE DEVELOPING, USES OF TRAINING TECHNOLOGY, AND COOPERATIVE ARRANGEMENTS WITH BUSINESS 473
Charles Slack

THE CASE FOR CONCENTRATING TITLE III FUNDS ON THE PREDOMINANTLY NEGRO COLLEGES 478
Michael Horowitz

PERSPECTIVES ON CHANGE 485

VI INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION AND THE FUTURE

LOOKING AHEAD IN INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION 495

STRUGGLE AND PROMISE--A FUTURE FOR LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES 499
Morris Keeton

THE SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATION OF INTER-INSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION 508
Robert J. Havighurst

PERSPECTIVES ON THE FUTURE 524

VII RECOMMENDATIONS 535

APPENDIX A TEXT OF TITLE III HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 547
APPENDIX B LIST OF PARTICIPANTS AND CONTRIBUTORS 552

PREFACE

Interinstitutional Cooperation has a fixed place in higher education. It remains for colleges and universities to put this device to more effective use. This conference, held at Wingspread - the Johnson Foundation Center in Racine, Wisconsin, focused attention on the uses of interinstitutional cooperation as a device to support developing institutions, and as a consequence to upgrade higher education as a whole.

Developing colleges is the name given to institutions which are struggling for survival and are isolated from the main currents of higher education but which at the same time are colleges with a potential to make a substantial contribution to the educational resources of the nation. Support for these colleges, to engage in cooperative programs with stronger colleges, is supplied under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965. The Act as a whole directs higher education resources to the resolution of pressing domestic problems.

The root of the Developing Colleges Program, as Title III is officially labeled, is to be found in the initiatives taken by students on the campuses of predominately Negro Colleges in the late 1950's. In addition to launching the contemporary phase of the Civil Rights Movement, these students caused the major philanthropic foundations to reconsider their policy of withholding aid from predominately Negro colleges. The reasons for the policy was the assumption that the 1954

Supreme Court desegregation decision would lead to the demise of predominately Negro college higher education. Demonstrations by Negro college students made it clear that they have a substantial contribution to make to America. The foundations learned for themselves that integration in higher education was a long and difficult process which the call for all deliberate speed only initiated.

Direct involvement by the Federal government came when President John F. Kennedy in June of 1963 urged leaders of higher education to expand cooperative relationships linking northern universities with small and predominately Negro colleges in the South. 1964 produced a range of experimental cooperative programs and the active support of Congresswoman Edith Green. Legislation to support this activity and to broaden it to include all developing institutions was submitted in 1964 and finally passed as part of the Higher Education Act in 1965.

Title III represents a departure in the history of federal participation in the enhancement of quality and the expansion of opportunities in higher education. It is a movement away from the traditional path of categorial aid toward one of general assistance which looks to upgrade the institution as a whole. It anticipates the linking of the resources of the developing with those of the advanced for the benefit of both. The movement is toward making education available for all, and it begins - quite correctly - by seeking to strengthen the institutions which are weak but which bear the major brunt of the teaching task. As the United States Office of Education accepts the charge to release the potential of the developing colleges, a partnership with the developing colleges will emerge. This interaction alone will substantially overcome the isolation faced by these institutions and will draw them into the main currents of higher education.

The impetus to hold this conference came after a year-long study by the Institute of Human Relations of patterns of interinstitutional cooperation in higher education. This research was funded by the United States Office of Education Bureau of Higher Education Research. The study aims to collect statistical and anecdotal information which would be useful to the administration of Title III. The thirty participants invited to the conference included social critics, educators, members of government agencies and foundations as well as participants in the Developing Colleges Program both as established and developing institutions. These varied perspectives enriched our review of Title III's first year of operation.

This volume is part of a three-fold effort by the Office of Education to disseminate information on interinstitutional cooperation in higher education. In addition to this conference report, a paper by the author, "Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education" has appeared as number 21 of the New Dimensions in Higher Education series under the editorship of Everett H. Hopkins. The third report, A Current Assessment of Cooperative and Exchange Programs and Their Implication for Title III of the Higher

Education Act will be forthcoming. All of these efforts are supported by the Bureau of Higher Education Research of the United States Office of Education.*

The formal presentations and conference discussion, reproduced as papers and perspectives, document that interinstitutional cooperation among colleges of different levels of quality works and that it should be dramatically expanded. The theoretical framework offered and the suggested social uses of the cooperative arrangement all deserve much greater scholarly attention.

Many individuals and institutions contributed to this volume. My major debt is to the contributors of the essays and to their respective colleges and universities which in silence have subsidized this conference. For direct support I am indebted to the Office of Education through the assistance of Dr. John Blue, Dr. Winslow Hatch and Dr. Broadus Butler; to Dr. Merriman Cuninggim for the Danforth Foundation support; and to Dr. Leslie Paffrath for the Johnson Foundation. As only a year of study makes clear, this study nor the conference would not have been possible without the support of the University of Wisconsin. My debt is particularly great to the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, and to its Vice Chancellor, Charles Vevier.

Behind any effort of this magnitude are the sacrifices and creative contributions of many others. The Research Assistants in this project, Ruth Neilsen and Susan Sancomb deserve much of the credit for what-

---

*See Inside Back Cover

I INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION FOR THE ESTABLISHED AND DEVELOPING COLLEGES

THE SETTING

The Developing Colleges Program, Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, is now in its second year of operation. $27 million has financed 249 cooperative programs which have either linked a developing college to an established institution or developing colleges to each other.

This legislation is unique not only in that it prompts cooperation within higher education, but also because it makes available financial assistance to institutions which have been "isolated from the main currents of higher education" and which are "struggling for survival." The Title III funds represent a catalytic input which is designed to release the potential, these developing institutions have to make a "substantial contribution" to the national resource in higher education.

Although the initial Title III programs occurred chiefly between small Negro colleges in the South and white northern institutions, their impact reaches far beyond these circles. As "models of reciprocal enrichment," these pioneer projects point to possible answers to some of the pressing problems facing higher education generally.

It is an opportune time, then, to assess the experience to date and to plan for the future. For this purpose, 28 prominent educators, scholars, social critics, and government and foundation representatives assembled in March, 1967, for a conference on interinstitutional cooperation in higher education. The two-day conference at Wingspread, the Johnson Foundation Center, Racine, Wisconsin, was sponsored by the Institute of Human Relations of the University of Wisconsin in cooperation with the United States Office of Education, the Danforth Foundation, and the Johnson Foundation. This book will present the papers given at the conference as well as some of the perspectives, insights, and recommendations that emerged during the event.

Although Title III funds have been limited and the pressure to get this innovative program underway has been intense, many important undertakings have been launched, in curriculum development, joint use of resources, cooperative research. Dr. Willa B. Player, Director of the Division of College Support, of the U. S. Office of Education, describes these developments.

The idea that white northern universities would be joined to predominantly Negro colleges has a history. It is found, according to Arthur Singer (formerly of the Carnegie Corporation and now President of the Educational Development Corporation) in the studies of President John F. Kennedy's Panel on Science and Technology. Leadership came from Jerrold Zacharias, Sam Nabrit, and Stephen Wright. Although not mentioned in this chapter, it also involved many others including Hobart E. Taylor, Jr., Broadus Butler, Herman Branson, and Congresswoman Edith Green. In the wake of the march on Washington, a decision was made to take action to link higher education, North and South. The Nabrit-White-Zacharias paper was the first projection. Mr. Singer considers this paper--included here--the best document available on the problems of developing colleges and what northern institutions can do to assist them.

From the viewpoint of a president of a developing college, interinstitutional cooperation seems to have gone through distinct stages. The most recent of these stages is the Title III government-supported phase. In retrospect, its weakness lies in the limited support available, the bland nature of the programs, and the threat they present to the identity of the small college. President L. H. Pitts of Miles College reviews these stages and presents his convictions that the developing institutions are at the cutting edge in relating education to American ideals. Hence, he urges, their priorities must be given priority. In many respects, the fate of the predominantly Negro colleges is central, for their development has put American higher education on trial. Attention was finally turned to Negro higher education in 1963. President Kennedy took the initiative in calling for a renaissance to advance the quality of education in Negro institutions, establish a dialogue with white higher education, and provide mutual enrichment through this interaction. As Dean Hugh Gloster of Hampton Institute reviews the last four years of effort, he points to numerous experiments in cooperation involving both private and public institutions. His assessment is that the need of the predominantly Negro colleges remains demonstrably clear in the light of the manner in which the Negro has been historically shortchanged.

The problems that have confronted cooperative programs are related to the failure of established institutions to differentiate among the 120 Negro institutions as to quality, the appearance of condescending attitudes, and the fact that really top flight scholars from northern universities have not participated in the program. On the positive side, he points to the real opportunity that cooperation offers higher education to make a human commitment, to diversify its educational setting, and to feed into developing institutions young people of potential who are interested in teaching.

Cecil Patterson, Professor of English from North Carolina College at Durham, presents the way in which interinstitutional cooperation between an advanced and a developing college worked at the classroom level. The factor of size, the inadequacies of organization, and the inability to plan made the project difficult to mount, even when the funds were in hand. Fears of being dominated by "big brother" and by the "great white father" complicated the effort, as did a different order of priorities from the two respective ends. Added to this was an unwillingness on the part of the established institution to assert its opinions. Yet success has come in the infectious attitude for change, in curriculum development, and in cooperative research. Now it is even clearer that much more can be accomplished as mechanisms for coordination improve and longer range planning becomes possible. But the costs of development are high and money is needed, at the outset, to find out what funds should be requested for.

As we look back with the aid of an Office of Education, foundation, presidential, dean's, and professorial view, still other perspectives emerge. There is the view from the developing institution, with emphasis upon its need but also upon the integrity of its efforts. From the established institution comes a cross current of views on possible offerings, coupled with a concern whether these are either appropriate or good enough. Lingering is the question of how substantial is the racial factor. Together, these provide the setting for interinstitutional cooperation in higher education as it is now moving.

ACHIEVING ACADEMIC STRENGTH THROUGH INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION: UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION VIEW OF TITLE III

Willa B. Player
Director, Division of College Support
Bureau of Higher Education
United States Office Education

The idea of interinstitutional cooperation is not unique with Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965. In fact, the need for and advantages of cooperation among institutions of higher learning have been recognized and accepted for many years. As far back as 1929 a variety of cooperative relationships came into existence among institutions, in the interest of economy and quality. At that time because of institutional rivalries and patterns of segregation interinstitutional cooperation was not as frequent, organized, or extensive as it is today. Through the pooling of resources and talents, institutions have been able to broaden their offerings, improve the calibre of their courses, and take advantage of facilities and equipment not existing on their own campuses. The experience and knowledge gained through existing cooperative efforts play a valuable part in the formulation of Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 - Strengthening Developing Institutions, and in the testimony which led to its final passage.

Title III may be considered unique in at least two respects.

The first is that it is the only federal aid to higher education program which has support of cooperation among institutions as a primary purpose. Second, and equally important, it is directed toward a group of institutions which in the past had little or no chance of receiving support from the federal government or from private benefactors of higher education.

A careful examination of the wording of Title III, specifically the statement of purpose, reveals that developing institutions possess many of the characteristics which have previously been deterrents in securing financial assistance. Developing institutions must be "for financial and other reasons struggling for survival." They must be "isolated from the main currents of academic life." To avoid the appearance of a welfare program--avoiding embarrassment for institutions seeking aid--and to encourage wise expenditure of federal funds, the Congress wisely included some other qualifications in the Act. Developing institutions should have the desire and potential to make a significant contribution to the resources of our nation. They should be accredited or close to accreditation and at least five years old.

While it is true that smallness is generally a characteristic of developing institutions and smallness can often be a primary factor in an institution's inability to improve its academic quality successfully - smallness alone does not characterize a developing institution. Obviously there are many small institutions which are ranked among the best in the country.

Geographical location is not necessarily a characteristic of developing institutions and the Congress recognized this by having institutions apply directly to the Office of Education for support rather than allocating either the first appropriation of $5 million or the second of $30 million to the 50 states for administration through state commissions. There are developing institutions in California, New York, and Nebraska as well as in Alabama, Mississippi, and Kentucky in vastly differing circumstances. In total, in the first year of operation, institutions located in 38 states and the District of Columbia received grants under Title III.

Lack of adequate financial support and often lack of adequate resources - both in terms of trained staff and facilities - are frequently the basic deterrent to institutional progress and growth. Title III addresses itself to these factors by awarding funds to eligible developing institutions which propose effective programs of interinstitutional cooperation. Cooperation can take and has taken many forms. Last year, the 84 grants for cooperative arrangements were awarded to groups of developing institutions which either worked among themselves by sharing their assets and helping each other solve their problems or worked together and with a stronger, more established institution, with the latter often providing guidance and expertise. There were cooperative programs or arrangements which involved one developing institution and one or more established institutions, and there were other cooperative programs in whcih developing institutions relied on the resources of business entities.

The most frequent arrangement was one in which one or more developing institutions had the benefits of the talent and resources of established or cooperating institutions. While the Act contains specific guidance on the characteristics of a developing institution, its only clue to the characteristics of cooperating institutions is found in the reference to drawing on "the talent and experience of our finest colleges and universities." No effort has been made to pinpoint our finest colleges and universities and coerce them into working with developing institutions and we have been pleased and proud at the voluntary response of established institutions. Last year nearly 70 well-known and well-respected established institutions participated in Title III grants. In some cases their assistance is based on specific resources or talents - a strong work-study program, strengths in one or more departments, effective programs for counseling and guidance, administrative expertise, or programs for remedial training; in other cases cooperation is on a very broad scale involving many parts of each institution.

It is easy to assume that in a cooperative arrangement between a developing institution and an established one, the established institution is in the role of a mother hen caring for a poor, weak chick. It is very likely that there are cases where this kind of relationship may exist but in order for an agreement to be fully effective and successful, the integrity and potential contribution of each participating institution must be recognized. An interinstitutional relationship which is based on feelings of sympathy and condescension cannot achieve the full benefits of cooperation. In this connection the National Teaching Fellowships are a significant reinforcement to institutional interchange. A developing institution may utilize highly qualified young scholars as faculty members while member of the permanent staff may be studying for the doctor's degree or undertaking an internship elsewhere. This program is a means of bringing faculty to the developing colleges, identifying a special need for them. Since National Teaching Fellows are full-time instructors the emphasis is on good teaching and high academic accomplishment.

In administering Title III, every effort has been made to avoid being mere check-writers. Efforts have been strengthened by the encouragement received from the academic community and from other parts of the federal government. This past August a conference with developing and cooperating institutions of higher education was held in Washington. For two days administrators of 60 institutions and representatives from 19 federal departments and agencies discussed their needs and resources. Further assistance and encouragement is provided through the Commissioner's Advisory Council, and the group of scholars who come to Washington each year to spend two or three days reading and evaluating Title III proposals. Their entire time is not devoted to reading and evaluating institutional proposals. Two lively discussion sessions are held where the readers, in effect, evaluate the Title III program and procedures and offer valuable suggestions.

Title III cannot and must not, be considered the sole solution to problems faced by developing institutions. It can serve as a catalyst for interinstitutional cooperation. As the program becomes better known, the number of institutions engaged in cooperative efforts is likely to increase. Even at this early stage of the Title III program, such an increase is evident with the number of Title III proposals submitted increasing from 310 in fiscal year 1966 to 528 in fiscal year 1967. Two hundred seventy-eight established universities and agencies are involved as cooperating partners.

The funds available have fallen far short of the amount of support requested by the institutions in both years and this trend is likely to continue. Insofar as is possible the effort is made to direct applicant institutions to other federal programs when portions of their proposals cannot be supported with Title III funds. In particular, many proposals have included sizeable requests for various types of equipment - Title VI-A; others have included requests for support of their library which are more attuned to the purposes of Title II of the Higher Education Act. An area yet to be fully explored is the initiation or continuation or relatedness of support by private foundations.

While no attempts have been made to solicit proposals or to match institutions, guidance and advice have been given to many institutions. In the fall with the assistance of the regional offices, meetings which were attended by more than 800 representatives of prospective applicant institutions were held throughout the country. At these meetings two members of the Division of College Support staff, Office of Education, discussed Title III and the procedures to be employed in applying for support. In addition to the formal meetings, numerous individual conferences have been held with institutional representatives both in Washington and in the field.

Proposals from developing institutions do not and cannot be expected to have the polish and sophistication of the more established institutions. In some cases, it is obvious that cooperation with an established institution has begun very early and the established institution has assisted its developing partner in the preparation of a Title III proposal. When interpreted as part of a more involved program, this is a very valid service. There are cooperative programs which include arrangements whereby established institutions make the services and knowledge of their development offices available to developing partners.

The need for a greater understanding of interinstitutional cooperation is evident in some of the Title III programs - institutions may ask for support for a cooperative arrangement and not name a cooperating partner or they may name a partner and it is obvious that the relationship is superficial. There have been cases where institutions have agreed to cooperate and either their plans are totally unrealistic in magnitude or else they are not related to the needs, problems and resources of the institutions involved. Nevertheless, a major portion of institutional proposals strengthen the belief that the possibilities for cooperation are vast as well as exciting. A few of the interesting programs which have been proposed for support under Title III will illustrate this observation. Some of these were supported in fiscal year 1966 and will probably be continued this year; others are under consideration for the first time in 1967.

In a broad program of cooperation one developing institution is working with an established institution in another state. They are engaged in a program of curriculum development which is directly related to the needs and problems of disadvantaged students; they have established a plan for faculty development with the goal of having 12 of their faculty members obtain the doctorate by 1970 with the remainder of their faculty having a minimum of the master's degree. The established institution is sending members of its faculty to the developing institution as visiting scholars. These scholars remain at the developing institution for at least four to six weeks and some spend a semester there. While at the developing institution, the scholars assist in the curriculum development program and also teach in their disciplines. Short-term leaves are granted to administrative personnel to improve their skills through formal training and consultation. A counseling and student services program has been initiated with special concern for the needs and problems of disadvantaged students; and the two institutions are engaged in long-range planning for the developing institution.

A newly formed consortium involves nine institutions located in different parts of the country. Three of the institutions are established, the remaining six are developing. Four of the nine are predominantly Negro institutions. The group is a purposely diverse one which has enough similarities in basic educational philosophy to make cooperation worthwhile. Their desire to cooperate is based on the principle of self-help and it is felt that each particular partner can contribute useful assistance to the others. Their program will be carried out through a series of interinstitutional visits, each lasting a minimum of two days. Prior to the initiation of visits, the institutions plan to hold a conference to determine their needs and resources and to establish a timetable for carrying out the purposes of the consortium. Each participating college can receive up to a total of 15 days of consultation during the first year and no college will be required to commit more than a total of 15 days time to the other institutions. The consortium is requesting support for travel and subsistence only.

The salaries of the persons who are conducting the visits will be financed by the institutions.

The need for upgrading and updating faculty is expressed frequently in the Title III proposals. One institution seeks to expand its program of faculty improvement with funds for grants to allow faculty members to engage in study leading to the doctorate. They are also seeking to assist other faculty members in keeping up-to-date in their respective fields and wish to provide study grants for administrative personnel. Faculty members on study leaves are temporarily replaced by visiting professors and by National Teaching Fellows, also a part of the Title III program. In awarding study leaves an effort is made to achieve a balance between faculty in the natural sciences and mathematics and those in the humanities and social studies. In this program the developing institution is relying on the assistance and resources of a number of nearby, established institutions.

Another approach to the elimination of academic and professional isolation is being taken by a group of four developing institutions working in conjunction with an established institution located within 100 miles of each institution. This group has developed faculty study groups in sociology, mathematics, and physics with plans to expand into other areas in the coming year. The groups conduct 6 four-hour Saturday sessions throughout the academic year which include discussion and study of the following: recent research and studies in the field of concern; studies relating to teaching their particular field at the undergraduate level; identification of pertinent bibliographic and resource materials; development of new courses and materials; and the relationship of subject matter to the type and level of materials taught and expected at both the high school and graduate levels. The established institution assists primarily by acting as convener and coordinator for the groups and also provides consultant services as needed.

In addition, these five institutions are engaged in a training program for institutional research with the eventual goal of establishing a joint center for institutional research. The operation of the training program is like the faculty study groups with the established institution proving leadership and cooperation.

All of the institutions within one state have formed a consortium to implement participation in a state-wide educational TV program. They are seeking Title III support to supplement their present ability to participate in this program. By sharing the best faculty members of the participating institutions through educational TV, it is anticipated that instructional quality will be improved; the curricula of individual institutions can be broadened; faculty workload may be lightened; and both faculty and students will be exposed to high quality instruction. The program is envisaged as a potentially self-sustaining one with requests for federal support diminishing each year.

The awareness of regional needs and problems is evidenced in a proposal submitted by an institution located in the Southwest which has a large enrollment of American Indians. In an effort to reduce the number of dropouts within this group, the college wishes to initiate an intensive English program with emphasis on the teaching of English as a second language and the necessary tutoring and counseling which would be required by this group. While the primary concern in this program is with American Indians, it is also pertinent to the needs of Spanish-Americans and foreign students. The college would be assisted in this program by the local office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and by an established institution which has an outstanding program for the teaching of English as a second language.

Several institutions have requested support for the initiation of cooperative work-study programs which would involve alternating semesters of work and study. One developing institution is benefiting from the experience of an established institution which has an outstanding cooperative work-study program. Through this interinstitutional effort, the curriculum of the developing institution is being completely reorganized.

In an effort to improve academic quality, four developing institutions with a history of interinstitutional cooperation have requested support for a five-year program of visiting scholars. If approved, the program would bring two distinquished visiting scholars to each of the participating colleges each semester. Professors from the four developing institutions would serve as exchange professors at the home institution of the visiting scholars where it is feasible. It is anticipated that over the five-year period this program would bring about substantial improvement in the curricula of these institutions, in the quality of instruction, and in the resultant performance of graduating students.

While at the outset, the major motivating force encouraging interinstitutional cooperation was the persistent shortage of finances, it is heartening to identify other reasons prompting broader and deeper relationships. One significant shift, for example, has been away from programs existing between the predominantly Negro college located in the South and white institutions in the North, to Negro and white colleges in the same community, state, and/or region. The cooperative agreements thus become more relevant to institutional growth and to community enrichment. Yet another reason is that the level of academic strength which can be attained from the movement and interchange of faculty and students among the campuses of the nation's colleges and universities is measurable in terms of institutional vitality.

HOW COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS INVOLVING PREDOMINANTLY NEGRO COLLEGES GOT STARTED

Arthur Singer
President, Educational Development Center

Most of you may be familiar with the story of how these cooperative programs involving predominantly Negro colleges evolved. There has been considerable Rockefeller Foundation activity through the years, of a peripheral kind, but I think it was President Kennedy who first thought of trying to develop a network of cooperation within higher education, North and South. In 1962 the President's Science Advisory Panel, in which Jerrold Zacharias played a major role, was reviewing the problems confronting education in America, when it became apparent to the members and particularly to John Fisher, Francis Keppel, and Steve White that Negro education was one of the major problems. To better define this problem, a group of Negro college presidents including Martin Jenkins, Luther Foster, Steve Wright, and Sam Nabrit were invited to Washington to discuss means for describing the problem and for projective means for its resolution. The meeting focused upon how higher education in the North might be linked to the South for the betterment of the Negro colleges.

That meeting led to a paper prepared by Zacharias, Nabrit, and White (Steve White, who was on the staff of ESI, actually drafted the document). That paper, which is attached, is in my judgment the best document I've ever read on the problems of developing colleges and what northern institutions can do to assist their program of development. It's never been published before, and its recommendation remains highly pertinent even today. It proposed setting up two large scale consortiums, one in the North and one in the South. There would be an instrument in the middle between the two areas to try to relate in a systematic way the resources of the strong universities in the North to the predominantly Negro college in the South.

The report got to John Gardner, then president of the Carnegie Corporation, and he undertook the task of bringing such a structure into being. He didn't feel the Corporation was the appropriate instrumentality, and so he presented the idea to Logan Wilson of the American Council on Education. In retrospect, this was a mistake. ACE was at that time examining the question of whether or not it should be an operating agency in higher education, whether it would remain simply a group studying, lobbying, and seeking legislative influence. It ultimately decided on the latter course.

In any event, under the ACE auspices a special committee was set up to plan for this middle ground organization which was going to be modeled after the Institute for Services to Education. For the first year, programs were assigned by the ACE; but it soon decided to get out of the operating role. The responsibility for beginning cooperation was then assigned to ESI.

The Carnegie Corporation continued to take an interest in this program although not as the entrepreneur of the structure. Partly this arose out of experience MIT had in progress, a one-to-one relationship which was started in 1959 with Oklahoma City University. I think it is still the most powerful success story in a one-to-one relationship and it still continues. Oklahoma City University is largely a white college. MIT has worked with it now for about seven years in a very intensive way.

Carnegie Corporation tried to implement this kind of relationship with a number of Negro colleges: the University of Wisconsin attached to Texas Southern University, North Carolina College, and North Carolina A & T; Tuskegee and Michigan; Brown and Tougaloo, Florida A & M, and Florida A and T and two or three others.

My own impressionistic judgment is that these are not universally successful, that the whole notion of trying to build one-to-one institutional cooperation could have been a wrong premise. We could have wasted a few million dollars of Carnegie money. But this assessment may be premature, because I don't have any clearly empirical data on whether or not these institutional cooperatives helped. Maybe they have been more successful than I suggest. Besides which, we haven't had much time to test them.

Another approach was going on simultaneously through ESI. During the summer of 1964 they set up five summer institutes in physics, biology, mathematics, history, and English. These were of different degrees of success. At Princeton a professor of physics ran a very able program for 38 physics teachers from southern Negro colleges. They used the PSSC (Physical Science Study Committee) course and participants studied for the summer. The high school physics teachers throughout the country over the last six years have had an average beginning score at such summer institutes of 40 and a completion score of 48 after the summer. These professors of physics from Negro colleges had an opening score of 16 and a completion score of 33. The conclusion at the end of this was that physics was a subject that was not being taught.

The other institutes had less hard data to measure achievement. In any case, in 1965 there was another round of summer institutes in eight or ten different places and they continued this past summer. They've been taken over largely by the NSF (National Science Foundation) and are incorporated into their summer school program. Now they're running into Title VI problems and can't be tied in directly with the Negro colleges.

Simultaneously, in the summer of 1964, E.S.I. ran the first writing conference to develop new materials for pre-college programs for entering students in Negro colleges. This also hasn't been dramatically successful although the returns aren't all in. Developed were a whole package of new materials based on Socratic methodology concentrating on structure and fundamentals and based on inquiry methods of learning. They've been using it now for two years in six centers in the South in pre-college programs and they've also been used in Saturday schools during the freshman year. The drop-out rate in the first year for these students has been only 12%. This is compared to the average in Negro colleges of a third in the first year. On the other hand, the failure rate of these students, freshman-sophomore, is 55%, so roughly two-thirds do not complete the course satisfactorily.

We are now going through new material preparation and revision, on the basis of the experience we've had. It is to include not only the pre-college program, but also the similar effort at the first two years of college, because one of the reasons why this drop-out and failure rate may be occurring is that the pre-college program is very different from what is encountered in the first two years of college.

My feeling, on the basis of this little experience, is that the bi-lateral arrangement really doesn't make much sense or isn't proving out very successfully. Institutional cooperation of the kind that brings the resources of a strong department of a large university to bear on a number of developing institutions or the use of professional societies in a similar manner, is a more fruitful approach.

One final observation, I think that one of the things we've learned so far in these piddling efforts under ESI aegis, has been that we are attacking the problem of these developing institutions with an incredibly trivial notion of scale. We absolutely must begin to think in much larger terms. I believe that the Ford Foundation has a developing institution program which last year gave a $25 million grant to NYU. They gave a $35 million grant to Columbia. Either of those two grants is the financial equivalent of the total of Title III. We're just fooling ourselves, hiding our heads in the sands, if we are pretending that we can do something about 125 colleges in the South with this insignificant sum. When you open the program to 1800 colleges, i.e., include all developing institutions, $30 million is a trivial approach to a massive problem.

PROGRAM FOR NEGRO COLLEGES

Samuel M. Nabrit, President, Texas Southern University

Stephen White, Educational Services Incorporated

Jerrold R. Zacharias, Professor of Physics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Almost without exception, Negroes in the American South attend schools in which both students and teachers are predominantly or exclusively Negro. Nearly all Southern Negroes who continue into college do so at colleges in which the student body, faculty and administration are exclusively or predominantly Negro. The cycle is closed when graduates of these Negro colleges return as teachers to Negro elementary and secondary schools, or as faculty and administration in Negro colleges.

The Negro in the North is somewhat more likely to attend a school that serves white students as well as Negroes, and has more opportunity to attend private or public institutions of higher learning which discriminate neither in principle nor in practice. It remains true, however, that the urban Northern Negro attends in most instances predominantly Negro schools, and that many Northern Negroes choose, for one reason or another, to continue their education in Negro colleges.

This paper, and the proposals it contains, do not deal with the moral, social or cultural significance of this situation. They merely recognize the fact that the situation does indeed exist, and further that for some time to come a large number of Negroes will prefer, for their own reasons, to take their higher education in Negro colleges.

It is clear that the problems of Negro education are broad and pervasive, and are themselves only part of larger social and economic problems. The proposals which follow deal with the needs of the Negro colleges, in the belief that much can be done, and done quickly, to raise the intellectual level at which they operate, and in the further belief that a sharp improvement in the quality of Negro higher education will be reflected immediately in Negro elementary and secondary school education. There is no implication that such a program will provide a panacea for all the needs of the larger Negro community, nor even that it can be the major or the most necessary element in a total program directed toward those needs. Rather, it is looked upon as something which can be done at once, for which the means are readily at hand, and which can yield benefits of great worth.

More than seventy colleges exist which have been brought into being to serve Negro students. Most are in the Southern or border states. Almost without exception, they are directed by Negro presidents; faculties and administrative staffs are predominantly Negro. The largest number are state-supported; others have connections with the Baptist, Methodist or (in one case at least) Catholic church; some are privately endowed and supported. Together they are serving approximately 125,000 students. At present, enrollments are growing rapidly--although perhaps not as rapidly as those of other institutions of higher education. It is probable that in the near future, their rates of growth will begin to surpass those of the other colleges and universities.

In one respect at least the needs of these Negro institutions are identical with the needs of all institutions of higher education: far greater financial support than they now enjoy is necessary for their proper functioning. The Negro colleges stand, however, at a far lower level than their white or mixed counterparts. The material base of any great educational institution lies in its library and its laboratories; most Negro colleges are deplorably deficient in both.

Little will be said further about this direct financial problem; it is a forthright need, and one which can be met by forthright methods. In terms of the total American educational outlay, it is a small need. All the Negro colleges together do not enroll as many students, or employ as large a faculty, as four of our largest state universities. A general sense of responsibility toward the Negro colleges by the entire American community would solve these direct financial problems overnight.

A far more serious deficiency, and one which will not be met by the provision of books, equipment and space, is to be found in the qualifications of the students who enroll in the Negro colleges, and the faculty to which those students turn for instruction. There is no reason to believe that this deficiency arises out of any inherent incapacity; on the contrary, it can be assumed that the spectrum of native ability within the Negro colleges is no different from that to be found within any of all but the most highly selective of the mixed colleges. It may indeed be that the native ability at the Negro college is higher than that in the neighboring white Southern college and university, whose best students and faculty are steadily bled away to the North.

Southern students enter the Negro college, however, inadequately prepared for higher education. They come to the colleges from secondary schools that are understaffed, under-equipped, and taught by men and women who have been themselves the victims of the same system. Earlier, they had passed through elementary schools that were equally depressed. Finally, behind all their schooling lay a domestic environment that was both economically and culturally deprived, and except perhaps in the important areas of morale and purpose offered little support for their educational efforts.

In general, these inadequacies exist in almost equal measure among Northern Negroes who enroll in Negro colleges. They, too, are likely to have come from the least satisfactory secondary schools, and from the bottom of the economic ladder. Their preparation for higher education is little superior to that of the Southern Negro.

One effect of this has been a staggering dropout rate among freshmen in Negro colleges. One third or more of the entering class is likely to surrender its aspirations for higher education before the first term of the freshman year has been completed. But even more deplorable, the presence in overwhelming numbers of unprepared students forces the Negro college to set its sights far lower than anything a college can honorably justify: the college to a large degree becomes a second high school, imparting the education that the student should have received two or four or even six years earlier. At the other end of the scale, the graduate of the Negro college, although he possesses a diploma and the privilege of adding B.A. or B.S. to his signature, is not qualified for graduate education and is not likely to gain entrance into any of the major institutions of graduate education.

The inadequacies of the faculty have already been foreshadowed. Those members of the faculty who have proceeded through the Negro educational system are likely to be at best half-educated. They may well be the best the system can provide, but the nature of their own training makes it unlikely that they will be able, by their own unaided efforts, to move the system forward; they are more likely to be its victims than its saviors.

Faculty members who come into the system from the outside are forced, by the nature of the student body, to lower their sights in becoming part of an institution which does not reflect their aspirations nor offer the opportunities which led them to seek a career in college teaching. They have neither time nor facilities to continue their own research, nor the support of talented and qualified associates. In consequence, they soon fall out of the mainstream of research, and thus inevitably prejudice their own capacities as instructors.

This is a grim picture, but there is much that it does not take into account. It omits, to begin with, the fact that there are many first-class students attending Negro colleges, and many first-rate faculty to instruct them. There are not now enough of either to convert the Negro colleges into the institutions they must become, but there are some, and they constitute a foundation upon which to build.

It omits, too, the reserves of morale and esprit that can be tapped within the Negro colleges at the first sign of improvement. The Negro community today is a thrusting, forward-looking, combative community; throughout history this kind of community is quickly reflected in its institutions of higher education and, at the same time, derives its leadership from those institutions.

There is also, within the colleges themselves, a powerful recognition of their needs, and a willingness to go forth and meet those needs by an appropriate means. The Negro colleges, whatever their deficiencies, are not to be called stagnant. Those who are responsible for their destinies, as presidents or as trustees, are most critical of the present state of the Negro colleges, and most determined to remedy it by their own efforts and sacrifices, and by the enlistment of all possible assistance.

There has been created, over the last ten years, a large reservoir of new educational techniques and a surging spirit of educational innovation. Many of the new techniques, and indeed much of the new educational materials, are directly appropriate to the needs of the Negro colleges. The spirit of educational innovation is such that the problems of the Negro college can be met with enthusiasm and a bold confidence.

Finally, there is an insistent desire, among whites and Negroes alike, to get on with this task. There is little need here to offer an explanation for this sudden and stimulating sense of urgency. It has created, on campuses at every major Northern educational institution, an explicit eagerness to assist in the regeneration of Negro education - and in all probability the same eagerness lies latent on Southern campuses.

In sum, the opportunity to make substantial advances in the quality of education offered by Negro colleges is ready to be grasped, and there are willing hands to grasp it. The balance of this paper offers an outline of activities that might be undertaken in the immediate future, and proposes a manner of organizing these activities and bringing them to fruition.

Before entering into the details of the proposed program, it might be useful to state some of the general principles that have emerged from educational reform activities during the past decade, and which are clearly applicable to this problem.

A. Massive efforts undertaken by highly qualified scholars and teachers can result in the creation of learning aids in which are incorporated pedagogical techniques and pedagogical innovation, without prejudice to the substance of what is being taught.

B. The training and re-training of teachers is facilitated and rendered more efficient by focusing that training explicitly upon the rationale and the use of specific learning aids.

C. The learning aids themselves must exploit all the avenues through which learning ordinarily takes place: they should include texts, collateral reading, laboratory experiments and equipment, films, tests and examinations, and any other device that may be brought to bear.

D. The teacher of a subject is not necessarily engaged also in adding to knowledge of the subject. Nonetheless, means should be found to link the teacher with the stream of scholarship in his subject.

As will be seen, there are many considerations in this problem which lie beyond the bounds of curriculum reform in the sense to which those general principles allude. Nonetheless, curriculum reform itself is basic to the requirements of the Negro colleges, and the pattern of curriculum reform which has been developed in recent years is directly applicable to the needs of the Negro colleges.

Earlier paragraphs referred to the deficiencies which the entering freshman brings with him into college, and which impose upon the college a general lowering of standards. These deficiencies are most grave in the general areas of communication, and of the relationship of education to the whole man, of mathematics and of inquiry.

Neither in his school nor in his home has the Negro student been encouraged to acquire the habits of crisp, economical speech or attentive listening. He is not the master of his own language, and it does not serve him efficiently as a tool.

In a nominal sense, he has learned to read, but he is likely to read obediently, in response to a directive. He is the servant of books, rather than their master; he does not know how to seek, upon his own initiative, for knowledge or for delight in printed matter.

Somewhere during his schooling the relationship has been lost that should link formal education with his own human development as an individual within society. History, literature and the arts are mastered, if they are mastered at all, in relation to examinations and promotion; their true significance to the whole man is lost. They cease, in short, to be humanistic studies and become items in a curriculum that exists only for its own sake.

Similarly, the mathematics that the student may have mastered is barren of its true import. That it has relevance to the real world, and utility in dealing with the real world, has never been made clear. The student has learned to compute, and perhaps to state formal proofs, but these achievements, like his achievement in the Humanities, constitute a closed system referring in every instance to nothing but themselves.

His academic knowledge, for the most part, rests on the authority of his teacher or his teacher's textbook. In the disciplines of school and college, he has little notion of how one sets out to elicit information which has not first been codified by someone else. Necessarily, he is quite capable of learning by means of experiment and mother-wit how one manipulates his social and domestic environment, but his approach to formal education is artificial and unreal.

These deficiencies must be remedied before the freshman can begin to profit from a college education.

It is proposed, therefore, that a complete body of learning aids be prepared, at the level of the Negro graduate from secondary school, dealing with Communications, the Humanities, Mathematics and Inquiry.

The first of these would deal with speech, listening, reading and writing. It would be intended to relieve the Negro college of the necessity for remedial work in these subjects - and would enable the college to presume that its freshmen would be able to carry the basic tools of communication into their first year of instruction.

In the Humanities, the emphasis on the new materials would be upon the relationship between humanistic studies and the individual. The material would be directed toward a comprehension of the knowledge that the student has already accumulated, rather than upon the acquisition of new "facts".

Similarly, in mathematics, the attempt would be made to make the transition between mathematics-by-rote and mathematics as a tool. Finally, a laboratory course would concentrate upon the methods and purposes of laboratory inquiry as a general means of procedure, rather than as an element in building a coherent structure in one science or another.

The manner in which these materials are to be used would be allowed to remain as a matter that must be determined by experience. It might be advisable to add a fifth year to secondary school for students admitted to college; to require one or more intensive summer courses, or to remove the college-bound student from secondary school in February of his senior year and transfer him to special schools, run by the Negro colleges themselves, for a concentrated effort during the nine months before matriculation. The materials should be flexible enough to bend to all these uses, and perhaps to others.

During the process of preparing these materials, the best available teachers from Negro colleges and secondary schools would be intimately associated with the work, and would provide part of a cadre of teachers intimately familiar with the materials. The first employment of the materials would be in a series of intensive summer institutes, in which a substantially larger number of teachers and professors would be trained in their use.

It might be added here that the existence of such materials would be of immediate benefit to a far larger group than merely the Negro students. Remedial materials of this sort are in general demand throughout the United States - where in general the level of skill in Communications, the Humanities, Mathematics and Laboratory are inadequate for the requirements of higher education.

Preparation of these materials, it should be stressed, will require a major effort. It will be necessary for scholars and teachers, in large numbers, to give their full attention to this program over a period of three or more years, and for an even larger number to contribute their summer time.

Students who have received this intensive pre-college training will enter the Negro colleges at a far higher level of proficiency than at present - although it is unlikely that they will yet be up to the mark established by the better universities.

To a large extent, learning materials appropriate for such students during the first two years at college are already available (in the sciences and mathematics) or are steadily being made available (in the humanities, the social sciences and languages). They are not now being used in Negro colleges in part because no effort has been made to introduce them - but in larger part because the colleges have been caught up in remedial work during the early years of attendance.

Typically, the Physical Science Study Committee Course in physics, including Advanced Topics prepared for that course, together with materials now being prepared for liberal arts colleges under the auspices of the College Physics Commission, form a coherent group of learning aids from which it would be relatively easy to select appropriate physics courses for freshmen and sophomores in Negro colleges (and indeed in any liberal arts or teacher-training institution).

Similar materials are nearing completion in Chemistry, Biology and Mathematics. Materials in the Humanities, in Social Sciences, in

English, and in History are somewhat less far along - but an aggressive program in any of these fields would produce a body of materials appropriate for use in Negro colleges.

Again, intensive summer courses for college faculty would be necessary, to train them in the rationale and the use of these materials. This is a well-trod path, and should offer no difficulties.

For the higher levels of college education, attention should be fixed upon the faculty rather than upon learning materials. The problem here over the short-term is two-fold: every effort should be exerted to offer the present faculty in Negro colleges an abundance of opportunity to add to their own qualifications; mechanisms should be devised by means of which young men, white and Negro, with advanced degrees from the better graduate schools, can be encouraged to join the faculties of Negro colleges.

If the latter of these is to be practical, there must be some assurance that careers will not be jeopardized by participation in the program. This implies that a direct responsibility for the program must be assumed by the Northern universities and colleges themselves, which must agree to consider academic work in the Negro colleges to be equivalent for purposes of advancement, under the proper circumstances, to academic work in their own institutions. It has other implications as well, which will be discussed below.

Through these Northern institutions, arrangements must also be made to permit the faculty of Negro colleges to attend the Northern colleges and institutions for one academic year or in some cases for two.

It would not be necessary for these visitors to attend special classes. Rather, they would be encouraged to attend, as students, the best and the most relevant courses in their subject matter. Such attendance would serve not only to bring them up to date in the substance of their subjects, but would expose them also to the best in pedagogical method.

In particular, there are now programs in being or in development at the most highly selective of American universities which will be ideally suited for such faculty. At Harvard, for example, thirty of the most able freshmen are being selected for a rapidly-paced, fundamental two-year course in Chemistry. At the level at which Harvard selects its students, it can be predicted that such a course will be an adventure not only for the student but for the professors who are faced with the tremendous task of staying ahead of them. The professors, in short, will be educated at a pace equal to that of the students; such an education would be a revelation to a member of the faculty of a Negro college, or of any other faculty.

Here again, the university must obligate itself further, Negro colleges are already understaffed; they cannot bear the strain of academic leaves unless replacements can be provided. The Northern universities must be prepared to make such replacements.

No faculty can exist above a level of mediocrity unless it functions within an atmosphere of creative effort. It is only by assisting in the accumulation of new knowledge that a scholar remains abreast of new knowledge, and capable of transmitting it to his students.

Neither can a faculty attract able young men unless it can offer them the opportunity to work creatively within their fields. The new Ph.D wishes most of all to make his own mark upon the field he has chosen for his career, and he does not willingly forego his chance.

With only a few notable exceptions at the best of the Negro colleges, there is no opportunity to carry on original research of any consequence. Thus, one of the central activities of a thriving institution of higher education is absent.

For the foreseeable future, it will be difficult or impossible for Negro colleges to carry on useful research in some of the fields of knowledge. High energy accelerators, sophisticated computers and enormous libraries are costly - and can be placed efficiently only where there are great concentrations of research talent.

On the other hand, there are fields in which the Negro college, once revivified, can move into the van and extend its influence, as well as its graduates, into all higher education. American literature, for example, is now taking on a new vigor as the Negro writer comes to play an increasing role. The Negro college possesses unique resources for the social scientist or the political scientist who wishes to understand the century in which he lives.

Finally, for many important fields of creative work, the provision of facilities is not a problem. Biology, which is now promising to become the liveliest of all the sciences, can be carried on at relatively low cost. Pure mathematics makes no demands at all upon the college budget, and Geology and Geography make relatively small demands.

Thus in principle the Negro college can take its rightful place in the world of research without calling for financial support on any improbable scale. Yet a problem still remains. The creative scholar is dependent upon other creative scholars for stimulation and for critical appraisal of his work. For the immediate future, the Negro college can hope to attract only a few eminent scholars, and a few who show promise of eminence: It may be able to find one or two first-rate mathematicians, for example, but it cannot count upon a first-rate mathematics department which will be stimulated by first-class Physics, Chemistry, Biology and Philosophy departments.

It is necessary, therefore, that the Negro colleges establish firm ties, formally set forth, with institutions of higher learning in other parts of the country. It is essential that the young scholar who comes to the Negro college retain a direct connection with the department from which he earned his doctorate, and that for a time his own work be carried on in conjunction with the work of that department. Once more there is the implication of formal association between the Negro colleges and the Northern colleges and universities, and the creation of a framework in which both groups may work together.

Finally, cutting across all these matters, is the problem of education in education itself. The training of teachers, for all levels of education, is a matter of central importance for the Negro college, in part because of the great needs of the Negro community - and in part because there are sound economic reasons for many of its graduates to enter the teaching profession. In the broader sense, it is central to this entire program that the Negro college produce, in time, the human resources for an educational system that will terminate the consideration of Negro education as a problem distinct from that of education in general.

A portion of the training of teachers will be done by the nature of the program itself. A corps of students, exposed for five years or more to the best and most carefully designed teaching methods, reinforced by superlative learning materials in the various disciplines, are likely to be well started in their preparation to teach others.

For the rest, the major universities are now beginning to move resolutely toward the improvement of their own schools of education. These universities should be encouraged to take into consideration the special needs of the Negro colleges, along with their own needs, in preparing new courses, in training teachers for those new courses, and in producing learning materials.

In order to bring this program into being, and to carry out the many tasks embodied in this program, it is proposed that two consortia of

American colleges and universities be created. One of these will be a consortium of the Negro colleges, the other a consortium of twelve to fifteen major universities.

Some contact has already been made with presidents of the leading Negro colleges. In all cases, their own support to the program has been pledged, and their firm intention to participate has been recorded.

In joining the consortium, the Negro colleges would commit themselves to direct cooperation in the preparation of learning materials and the retraining of teachers at all levels of education in the use of those materials; to the release of faculty for short periods of residence in the universities; to the restructuring of their curricula as this restructuring becomes possible; to the supervision of post-secondary school, pre-college education of prospective entrants; to the acceptance of faculty from the cooperating consortium under terms which permit that faculty to retain ties with their parent institutions; and to the encouragement of research activities within their colleges.

The university consortium would assume, as a group, the responsibility for the quality of the learning materials that would be produced; would be prepared as individual universities to release faculty for the various purposes set forth above; would make the administrative arrangements necessary to admit Negro college faculty as special students, in limited numbers; would in all respects consider service to any phase of this program, including temporary transfer of faculty to a Negro college to be equivalent to academic service within the universities.

Subgroupings within the consortia would be encouraged, under which one or two universities would take a direct responsibility for several Negro colleges, and in particular would provide them with administrative support.

The universities would also be prepared to encourage a mobility among its faculty and staff, which would permit repeated short visits, or occasional long visits to the campuses of the Negro colleges. Such visits would be of special importance to the maintenance of a high level of research activity in the Negro colleges.

To assume continuity, each college or university in both consortia would assign one member of its administrative staff, and at least one member of its faculty, to full-time service with the program.

On both sides, these responsibilities would be assumed for a period of at least ten years.

The problems of financing the program, by government or private grants and [illegible], would be assumed by the Negro colleges and the universities.

What has been presented above are the bare bones of an administrative arrangement. Before it can come into being, the colleges and universities must be recruited and must agree in principle to take part; they must thereafter work out the details of the arrangement and must seek the means to support the program.

INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION: THE PRESIDENT OF A DEVELOPING COLLEGE GIVES AN IN DEPTH VIEW

Lucius H. Pitts
President, Miles College

This paper is not intended to be a scientific paper, even though I have done a considerable amount of reading and research. It is rather an objective-subjective reaction in depth on the subject of interinstitutional cooperation from the fortunate-unfortunate position of the developing college. I have also relied on my own experience and observation as president of a developing institution which has had some exciting and profitable experiences in this area.

Cooperation among colleges and universities is not by any means a new phenomenon. It is almost as old as education itself. Such programs at some time have been an important part of the developmental programs of a few institutions fcr many years. This is particularly true of some small institutions which we now refer to as developing institutions. It is probably true in more than several cases that interinstitutional cooperation has been the difference between success or failure for some of our colleges.

The idea seemingly has caught the imagination of the educational world. The strength and prestige of such a device is so appealing that it is advocated from all quarters with mounting fervor. All of the motivating factors cannot here be delineated or assessed: perhaps simply emulation of others in an educational fad; perhaps possibility of spreading talent and dollars in such a way that excellence is transformed into a more constant thing throughout higher education; perhaps a means of promulgating certain educational theories for prestigious reports, and perhaps the genuine desire to make quality education available to the many and the masses. The fact is that there is now a pronounced growth of many devices for promoting interinstitutional cooperation.

The interinstitutional cooperative program has historically moved through several stages: the efforts of the more stable and reputable institutions; the consortium of small struggling institutions for survival and specialization in a given geographical area; the big brother stage seen especially during the height of the civil rights movement; and the present stage marked by foundation aid and federal support of these efforts through Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

The first stage of the program has occupied the longer period of time in the history of American education while the last two stages have occurred within the last decade. It has involved, in most cases, what in reality were superficial efforts and more often than not occurred between institutions which were advanced in development and possessed adequate facilities and reputable histories. Efforts at cooperative programs consisted of student exchanges, joint use of some limited facilities, e.g., libraries, an occasional joint venture in areas of research and faculty exchanges involving mainly guest lecturers or seminar programs. Relatively few of what we now call the developing institutions were participants in the cooperative ventures, though then, as now, they certainly stood to gain the most from the efforts. To be sure, some developing institutions did organize cooperative programs which enabled them to do things cooperatively that they could not have done alone.

The second developmental stage of interinstitutional programs brought a new concept of what these types of programs might contribute to survival of a few small colleges in the same community. By some form of agreed consortium, some institutions jointly recruited and hired one professor to serve all, shared science laboratories, developed a central library, shared lecture programs, allowed students to choose courses from any member of the consortium and gave credit at each individual college, did cooperative buying at a saving to each, and developed joint seminars and conferences. This kind of interinstitutional cooperation provided added quality in academic programs, larger and better faculty, more opportunity for specialization and a new concept of survival. The Atlanta University system is probably an example of such an effort.

The third developmental stage of interinstitutional cooperation parallels in part the civil rights movement in this country and was certainly influenced by the enthusiasm of the college and university students of this decade. The concern for quality and equality in education for all herald the coming of the "big sister concept". Many of these programs were inspired and begun by students who shared books, clothing, summers and deputations with students in struggling institutions.

This stage is marked by the concern of well-established institutions to assist struggling institutions, by and large Negro institutions, to strengthen themselves. Though these programs were on a relatively small scale, certainly limited by available financial support, they reminded those of us in education that cooperative programs between established and developing institutions [illegible] well be a channel by which struggling institutions, isolated from the educational mainstream, might be provided with an entry into the mainstream, and hence, education in America improved. If the potentials for such cooperative programs were to be realized, financial support must be sought. Even the best institutions could not bear the expense of a moderately extensive program. Efforts between developing institutions were also hampered by the lack of funds to support cooperative efforts.

We have now entered the fourth stage of development in inter-institutional cooperation. The beginning of this stage is marked by foundation support of some of these efforts by several foundations. Under the leadership of several of the well-established universities, and guided by some of the alert educators who, during the conflict in the South, saw the need, some cooperation was begun.

The enactment of the Higher Education Act of 1965 marked a significant change in these cooperative programs under Title III. The

γ

availability of federal funds is significant in another respect. Like federal support in other areas of education, it taxes the ingenuity of those of us in education. We are challenged to find new and better ways to improve education through cooperative programs.

Two of the basic areas in any institutional development have been aided by funds from Title III - financial assistance and an infusion of trained personnel and expert consultation needed for self-development. For well-established institutions, this act affords an opportunity for broadening their educational efforts. For all of American education, it is a test of our abilities to capitalize on opportunities for self-improvement.

The majority of the developing colleges have struggled and made progress in their educational efforts almost by operation "bootstrap," but the rapid pace with which education has moved in recent years has often served to widen the gap between where these institutions ought to be and where they are. This is particularly true of the predominantly Negro college. Interinstitutional cooperation provides one medium for helping to bridge this gap. It should be stated here that unless many of these developing institutions receive additional and significant help, the gap in the next 20 years will be too wide to close. This can easily be seen when we note that the trend in desegregation or integration seems to be a one-way street. We are not only widening the gap but doing almost irreparable damage to the Negro's image of himself and the institutions which he may be attending.

The new programs provide a rare opportunity for experimentation in education. The small developing college generally serves a student clientele which is in great need of significant help in many ways. They are all too often the children of unlearned parents. They generally come from small inadequate high schools. They have not been exposed to urban privileges, responsibilities and problems. They come in many cases eager to learn but can easily be caught in the confusion of bigness when compared to their original environment. Many of them who come to college are totally unprepared for the rigors of self-discipline which is imposed upon them, and with a distorted image of himself as an American citizen. Thus innovations and experimentations must be the order of the day.

A cooperative program with one or more established institutions allows the developing institution to provide group and individual help which would be impossible otherwise. With the help of such programs such exciting innovations as team-teaching, reading seminars, tutorial programs, special programs in drama, music, art, travel and advanced courses for the more advanced student is possible. Such a program, when it provides consultative service or exchange professors, also provides the kind of educational expertise to: establish guidance and testing programs; develop effective machinery for identifying students of promise in spite of their test scores; provide in-service training for its own faculty, and provide study opportunities for promising faculty members. This allows the regular routine of the college to continue without a break in the schedule of the current curriculum and begins to move the struggling institution into the mainstream of academic life of America.

WEAKNESSES

It should be made very clear here that we believe that effective and genuine interinstitutional cooperation can only be profitable in the long run when there is help flowing both ways between the cooperating institutions. If the well-established institution cannot find some benefits for itself in the program, if the relationship is always perpendicular from the established institution down to the developing institution, both institutions will suffer and may damage their identities. There must be built in a mutual aid for both, in new techniques developed, in new materials, in new understandings, and in improved educational perspectives.

Quite often there is found in some of the faculty exchange programs persons who are interested in gathering material for research or a new book, in getting involved in civil rights activities alone, or in experimentation in racial and sectional activities for "kicks". These kinds of emphasis give the faculties and students of developing colleges the impression that the interest is not in academic growth for the individual or the college but in changing the direction of the thinking of all present in this small institution. These people often act before they know enough about the background of the developing colleges and the person or student whom it serves.

The interinstitutional cooperative program has untold potential for the developing college. It is thus expected that these colleges will profit more from such programs than the well-established cooperating institution. Because of some of the obvious circumstances, very few of these developing institutions have been part of such programs. In recent years, population explosion in higher education, the civil rights movement, increased need of trained manpower personnel for the government, business and industry and the encouragement of federal aid to education have given great hope and promise. This kind of cooperation provides a real opportunity for education in America. It can salvage thousands of people in making use of the educational wastelands of this country.

SOME IDENTIFIABLE STRENGTHS

Improvement of educational services while minimizing cost - by:

a. identifying specialized areas of teaching and research in which cooperative arrangements may be desirable;

b. initiating cooperative activities in institutions and research among smaller institutions;

c. sharing consultants in a limited geographical area;

d. inter-library cooperation in purchasing, cataloguing, and loans of important documents;

e. cooperative recruiting and hiring in specific subject matter fields;

f. faculty exchange in a limited area or on term bases for special visiting professors, writers, etc.;

g. allowing predominantly Negro institutions to be more effective and to provide quality education for those who are going to attend these institutions for a long time.

We cannot deny the hard fact that for another 25 years, predominantly Negro institutions are going to be needed and many of them, if not most of them, will continue to exist.

This kind of cooperation helps by allowing the developing institutions to have the advantage of innovations and new techniques developed at the more established institutions. It lends aid to the development of new methods and materials to be developed in the cooperative process. It also lends itself for the more stable institution to do research, provide places for interns, to understand the mind and the problems of the disadvantaged by actually working with them rather than by surveys and written questionnaires.

Such a program allows the developing institution to have access to already developed plans of administrative operation of the established institution. It provides an opportunity for the established institution to experiment with proven plans for the larger or more stable institution to see if such a plan is workable for the developing institution. In this way both institutions are helped by the cooperation in this area.

This program of interinstitutional cooperation offers the predominantly Negro college the best opportunity in the history of education to move into the mainstream of the academic economy of this country and the world. The teaching fellows' program offers a realistic approach for compensatory work in the areas of reading, mathematics skills, and comprehension, written and oral communication, and improvement in diction and clarity of speech never before realized. As has been suggested by McGrath and others this, of course, requires a great deal of funding.

RECOGNIZABLE WEAKNESSES OR DANGERS

Among some of these weaknesses as seen by a developing college administration are:

a. the lack of time and funds to do the necessary planning for an effective program (pre-planned);

b. lack of staff in the developing colleges to take the leadership for such planning without affecting the regular routine of teaching necessary in a small college;

c. absentee leadership of cooperative programs;

d. one way operation (from big institution to small one);

e. academic prowess of established institution which could dwarf the creativity of developing college;

f. possibility of too much influence of funding agency or agencies;

g. faculty and staff turnover which could cause lack of continuity of specific parts of the program and frustrate students;

h. the developing college can too easily become a satellite to the established institution;

i. it could be too little too late;

j. it could become meaningless pretentiousness.

Most of the aforementioned weaknesses or dangers are self-explanatory. However, I should like to enlarge on a few of them: "Strength through cooperation is so appealing that it is advocated from all quarters and with mounting fervor"[1] - some have caught the vision but not looked at the practice, recommended the cure-all for everybody, every place, every time without any question of its suitability for the given institution of students.

Since it is necessary to achieve clarity of purpose and specify certain limitations, a staff is needed for the planning of such cooperation. The developing college quite often has to depend on the president and/or dean which is time-consuming. The established institution without extra funds must assign this task to a zealous professor who may have the interest but not the expertise. Where there are limited funds for the planning, a fuzzy program may get started with good intentions and it may not be recognized until too late that its failure or lack of effectiveness was structured in the lack of good structure.

The academic prestige and muscle of the established institution must be used wisely, less the developing institution try to emulate the cooperating institution in everything rather than in developing a program to meet the identifiable needs. The presence of an exciting and incitive teacher from the established institution, who may remain for one semester or one year and not be able to communicate to his colleagues at the developing college his enthusiasm and methods, leaves a student body with an empty feeling, leaves his colleagues feeling dwarfed and jealous of his reputation made on the campus. Thus the administration of the developing college has a problem of faculty and student frustration which could slow up the entire educative process in a given area or even on the entire campus.

The average developing institution is always seeking means and methods of interpreting to the public that it is moving ahead. The presence of such a program is in danger of being used for public relation purposes and could easily become meaningless pretentiousness. Such a program when used for improving the public image alone defeats the purpose of effective cooperation.

I am convinced that the greatest danger is that it is too little too late. Most of the developing institutions suffer from serious shortage of funds to sustain their established programs at the present levels, to say nothing of the needs for expansion and advancement into new fields. The increased funds needed for faculty salaries, improved facilities, maintenance, equipment and supplies and even for participation in interinstitutional cooperation is almost indefinable. However, education in America must go on and must improve or we perish as a democracy.

One of the most dangerous weaknesses of interinstitutional cooperation could be labeled "sameness." Funding agencies and cooperating institutions need to be very careful that we do not bow to this god instead of "projects to advance creativity in education." The staggering number of challenges in American education along with the rapidity of social and technological changes call for the most creative and noble efforts of educators in this century. Latent creativity of administrators and teachers has often been stifled by their knowledge that school "A" has been funded for a certain kind of project and they in turn may be writing and developing the same kind of program which has been funded in some other institution. There is also the danger that funding agencies with good intentions develop formulae or guidelines for project submission which are too limited. This could lead institutions to be less creative and to ignore some of the areas of cooperation which are more advantageous to the total solution of identifiable problems.

As institutions develop these programs, particularly between cooperating and developing institutions, it must be borne in mind that each institution must seek its own identity. In the interinstitutional program, one institution cannot dominate the other. The effort must be purely cooperative. The developing institution must not seek to become a replica of the larger and better established cooperating institution. Every developing college must seek to do those things which by virtue of its composition, locality, control, etc., it can do best. In short, it must seek its identity. We must bear in mind the institution's purpose and realize that larger and well-established institutions can do many things that developing colleges cannot do. But the developing college must have its uniqueness and by virtue of this uniqueness, it can do things which the larger institution cannot do. As the program progresses, the developing institution must move toward a point where it can increase its contribution to the program and toward the cooperating institution.

If I have in this paper spent much time on the negative side of the idea of interinstitutional cooperation, it was not my intention. I strongly believe there is more positive value in this kind of effort than negative. If I have pointed out more dangers, it is because I work in a developing institution with all of its challenges and frustrations. We have participated in several such programs, most of them voluntary and unfunded, and we have had some of the joys and disappointments herein described. I should hasten to add that it is our intention to intensify and increase them rather than slow up or decrease them. I share with Mr. E. McGrath in some of his recommendations for predominantly Negro colleges. The developing colleges are in my estimation working nearer the cutting edge of American ideals; therefore, they must be maintained and strengthened. Interinstitutional cooperation must be established among them and with the more established institutions. There must be a long-range planning prior to full implementation of priority projects, with increased opportunities created for the development of component and permanent faculties for these institutions called developing institutions.

A quote from Kenneth Clark will emphasize my next statement. In 1963 at a conference at Howard University, Dr. Clark said:

> Given the fact that a disproportionate number of Negroes are found in the lower socio-economic levels of our society, and are burdened with the additional problems of racial discrimination and segregation in employment which reinforce, prolong, and intensify the deficit of their lower status predicament, the problem of education effectiveness and economic status is a particularly pertinent one for Negroes.

A more than significant number of developing colleges in America are predominantly Negro in staff and student population. The success or failure of these institutions will affect the viability of our nation. Thus, a realistic program must be planned to compensate for these deficiencies already present and those that will come later in such institutions. These developing institutions will need immediate and continuous help in funds, friends, and in the expertise which can come, in part from and through interinstitutional cooperative programs.

CONCLUSION

American education is now on trial as never before in its history. Technological advances accompanied by socio-economic changes have thrust the school into a position that should give us cause to tremble in unpleasant anticipation. The coming explosion in college population, the current apparent rebellion on college and university campuses on the part of students and some faculties demand an answer from the classrooms of this nation.

The idea of interinstitutional cooperation offers us a rare opportunity as developing colleges to move toward a point where we can increase our contribution to the program of education for all and toward the cooperating institutions. Without some kind of cooperative effort, we will perpetuate what may be called a tragic pretense.

We must not plunge headlong into this venture without asking ourselves some pertinent questions. What are or should be the limitations of the institutional cooperative programs? How long can we find financial support for these programs. How long will they merit and receive federal support? What evaluation or devices should be designed to measure the success of these programs? How involved can we become in such programs without losing step with progress in our country, in other areas? How can such programs help the developing institution alleviate its most pressing problem of financing current operations?

As a representative of a developing institution, I should like to make a few recommendations:

1. that interinstitutional cooperation be continued and expanded;
2. that several pilot projects be undertaken in some urban community centering on one developing institution. Several agencies should plan with the cooperating institutions for providing funds, staff creative programs designed for that particular situation. In this manner it is possible to develop some expertise in materials, methods, and in administration;
3. that conferences such as this with more time for actual work be provided for institutional representatives interested in such cooperation;

4. that every effort be made to increase federal funding of such programs.

The idea of interinstitutional cooperation captivates the educational world today, and this is not too strong a term. This is essentially a new real possibility of a way out and forward for us. It appears to be a vehicle adequate to cope with problems readily perceived by many in this nation. This conference and this paper "rests on the premise that the majority of Americans mean what they say when they declare that all youth should have an equal access to education." The speed and effective implementation of such a program will bear testimony to the sincerity of our intellectual and philosophical utterances.

This program calls for some daring experimentation: a willingness to test hypotheses now present in our literature and develop new ones; a willingness to discard those that are found wanting; a determination to keep trying creatively until we reach some workable answers. It is not a trite statement to say that the future of American higher education will lie with those colleges and universities which are committed to the exploration of such creative possibilities.

NOTES

1. Journal of Education, (January, 1966)

COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS AND THE PREDOMINANTLY NEGRO COLLEGE : A DEAN'S VIEW

Hugh M. Gloster
Dean of Faculty
Hampton Institute
Hampton, Virginia

When the history of this country is written around the year 2000--if nuclear war has not destroyed mankind by that time--1963 will be recorded as one of the most important years in the evolution of American higher education and in the history of the American Negro.

It was in June of 1963 that President Kennedy summoned around 200 leading educators to the White House for the purpose of urging them to increase educational opportunities for Negroes. It was in October of 1963 that the American Council on Education--through its president, Logan Wilson--promised President Kennedy "to further the cause of educational opportunity" and immediately implemented this pledge by appointing a Committee on Equality of Educational Opportunity and by requesting all Council members "to assume active, constructive, and responsible roles within their respective communities, institutions, and organizations in efforts to secure full rights for all Americans." It was also in October of 1963 that the Council invited around forty selected educational leaders to Washington to plan a national program to improve opportunities for Negroes in higher education. The principal objectives of this program were as follows:

1. To strengthen the quality of the academic programs in the predominantly Negro institutions of higher education.

2. To stimulate a continuous and mutually constructive dialogue between the Negro college and university community and the rest of American higher education.

3. To secure greater opportunities for qualified Negroes in the academic professions, as well as in the undergraduate and graduate student bodies of integrated institutions.

4. To broaden the social and cultural perspectives of students, faculty members, and administrators both in the integrated and in the predominantly Negro colleges and universities.

After the President of the United States and the American Council on Education vigorously endorsed interinstitutional relationships between universities and predominantly Negro colleges as a means of upgrading the latter group of institutions, cooperative programs sprang into being at various places in the nation. For example, Cornell joined hands with Hampton, Michigan with Tuskegee, Brown with Tougaloo, Indiana with Stillman, Southern Illinois with Winston-Salem State, Tennessee with Knoxville, and Florida State with Florida A & M. More enterprising than all the others, Wisconsin undertook to work simultaneously with A & T College, North Carolina College, and Texas Southern.

Major educational organizations and private foundations also gave their support to cooperative programs. For example, in April of 1964 Educational Services Incorporated called a conference at the

Massachusetts Institute of Technology to discuss plans for eight-week summer institutes to be sponsored by major foundations at five universities in order to help selected teachers from five disciplines in predominantly Negro colleges to improve their course offerings.

At my own college, Hampton Institute, several cooperative programs were started in 1963 and 1964. In the fall of 1963, members of the Hampton administration met with representatives from Cornell, Yale, and Stanford to discuss the development and operation of possible cooperative programs involving administrators, faculty members, and students. In 1964 Hampton participated in the following cooperative projects: (1) the joint application of Hampton and Cornell for a government grant to support an exchange of administrators, teachers, and students; (2) the exchange of lecturers with Cornell during the summer session; (3) the provision of summer fellowships by Hampton and Cornell for Hampton teachers who wished to take graduate courses at Cornell during the summer; (4) a meeting at Hampton with representatives of Cornell for the purpose of planning--in addition to the existing program of reciprocal enrichment--exchanges of administrators and teachers and students, exchanges of plays and concerts and exhibits, independent study and research, and graduate fellowhips for Hampton alumni and teachers at Cornell during the regular academic year; (5) the participation of Hampton teachers in the previously mentioned summer institutes sponsored by ESI; (6) the joint operation by Hampton and

Yale of a foundation-supported summer school in New Haven for 100 culturally deprived but mentally gifted white and Negro tenth-grade boys, with Hampton providing the associate director and half of the faculty and student counselors; (7) the provision of two Hampton graduate students--one in English and the other in mathematics--and two student counselors for a summer school for talented but disadvantaged tenth-grade boys at Phillips Exeter Academy; (8) the appearance of President Holland as a main speaker, with the Secretary of the College and the Dean of Faculty serving as resource persons, at the New England Regional Meeting for School Counselors and Guidance Personnel in June at Brandeis University; and (9) the follow-up committee meetings with representatives of New England colleges and universities at Hampton and Wheaton College for the purpose of arranging a meeting of representatives from Hampton and New England colleges with principals and guidance counselors of Virginia high schools to plan joint recruiting and other cooperative programs in the Old Dominion.

In August of 1965 the United States Office of Education sponsored a two-day Conference on Cooperative Programs at Morehouse College in Atlanta, Georgia. This conference--which was attended by representatives of universities, predominantly Negro colleges, private foundations, educational agencies, and the United States Office of Education--consisted chiefly of presentation and discussion of reports concerning the organization and operation of cooperative programs.

This conference revealed a wide range in the quality of the cooperative programs as well as in the financial support given to these undertakings.

Beginning in 1965, universities and developing colleges, predominantly white as well as predominantly Negro, received increasing financial support from the Federal government and private sources. Cooperating institutions obtained substantial assistance for such programs from Title III--Strengthening Developing Institutions of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Accelerated governmental activity in the cooperative field has been paralleled by increasing private support for interinstitutional programs. Typical of such privately backed programs are the Special Summer Porgram of the Harvard Law School, the Harvard-Yale-Columbia Intensive Summer Studies Program, the Haverford Post-Baccalaureate Fellowship Program, the Indiana-Washington-Wisconsin Program for Graduate Study in Business for Negroes, and the UNCF-Minnesota Colleges Program.

The purpose of the Harvard pre-law program is to encourage outstanding Negro college students to consider a career in law during the summer after the junior year. Students who are admitted to this program must take a special introductory course in law as well as an approved course in the Harvard Summer School. All expenses--travel, tuition, room, board, a small living allowance, and $500 in lieu of summer employment--are covered by a foundation grant. The objective of the Harvard-Yale-Columbia program, which is similar in structure to the Harvard pre-law program is to discover outstanding Negro college juniors who are qualified to do successful graduate study in English or the social sciences.

The aim of the Haverford program is to offer all-expense fellowships "to young men and women of outstanding ability, for a year's study, at Haverford or at another of a small group of similar colleges (Carleton, Oberlin, and perhaps Bryn Mawr and Swarthmore) which have agreed to participate, to further prepare them for graduate or professional school." (Hampton decided not to participate in the Haverford program because outstanding Hampton students do successful graduate work without taking an additional year of undergraduate courses after graduation from college, because Hampton administrators and teachers would be embarrassed to ask outstanding Hampton students to follow such an undergraduate program after obtaining a Hampton baccalaureate degree, and because participation in such a program would tend to cheapen the Hampton baccalaureate degree and blemish the academic standing of the college.)

The purpose of the Indiana-Washington-Wisconsin program is "to provide formal graduate business study in the regular Master of Business Administration curricula at one of the sponsoring schools, plus additional educational experiences as required by the individual candidate." This all-expense program, which grew out of a recognition of the "gap between the supply of and demand for qualified Negroes in the business management career field," is planned "to hasten the entry of Negroes into managerial positions."

The goal of the UNCF-Minnesota Colleges faculty exchange program is"to improve the caliber of instruction in the nation's predominantly Negro colleges of the South." This program involves member colleges of the United Negro College Fund and the following schools in the St. Paul area: Carleton College, the College of Saint Thomas, Hamline University, Macalester College, and the University of Minnesota. In this program two junior faculty members from a UNCF college teach one semester at a Minnesota college and pursue graduate study at the University of Minnesota for at least one semester and two summers. The Minnesota college in turn sends a senior professor for a full academic year to the UNCF college from which the two exchange teachers come. During the exchange year the participating teachers receive their regular salaries; subsidies covering additional costs such as transportation, housing, and tuition are provided from a grant from the Louis W. and Maud Hill Family Foundation.

After four years of experimentation with cooperative programs as a means of accelerating the development of predominantly Negro colleges, we are now in a position to consider whether there is a need for such programs and to indicate what seem to be the major problems and advantages that have appeared in the operation of these enterprises.

To begin, it seems obvious that there is a need for cooperative programs and any other arrangements that can upgrade predominantly Negro colleges. These schools have been strongly influenced by 348 years of racial disadvantage and deprivation. For 244 years--from 1619 to 1863--Negroes were victims of slavery; and for 104 years--from 1863 to 1967--they have been victims of segregation. For the first 244 years of their life in this land Negroes usually had no education, and for the next 104 years they generally had unequal education. In four years, therefore, the predominantly Negro colleges have the difficult job of trying to help young people to overcome handicaps that reach three and a half centuries into the past. In this formidable task the predominantly Negro colleges are handicapped not only by limited funds but also by cultural isolation. Moreover, during the past few years these colleges have had the additional burden of being judged by national norms and of having to compete on equal terms with all other American colleges. By gaining access to the administrative, instructional, and investigative resources of large universities, predominantly Negro colleges, which enroll more than half of America's 200,000 Negro college students, can more effectively prepare individuals for successful life and work in an integrated society.

Now let us consider some of the major problems that have developed in the planning and implementation of cooperative programs.

One problem is the assumption by certain university personnel that predominantly Negro colleges are uniformly inferior. Knowledgeable individuals know that considerable diversity exists among these colleges and that the best of them compare favorably with other schools of their size and type in the South. For example, in competence of faculty and strength of academic program, several predominantly Negro institutions are outstanding among small colleges in their region. Moreover, Hampton tops all other small colleges in the South in endowment and is among the first five in the nation in her enrollment classification. Many investigators are surprised to discover that Hampton's endowment of $35,000,000 approximately doubles that of Barnard College, Hamilton College, and Colgate University. It is indeed unrealistic to put all predominantly Negro colleges in one basket and say they are alike.

Another problem is the tendency of certain university personnel to adopt a condescending and critical attitude toward the predominantly Negro college. Since cooperative programs involve a large university-small college relationship and a predominantly white university-predominantly Negro college relationship, this diversity in size and race sometimes produces differences and disagreements that demand the most reasoned responses of those in charge of these interinstitutional relationships. In this connection the following observation has been made concerning desirable attributes of the representative of each type of institution:

> . . . the university man must be sensitive and willing to learn. He must have an interest without being a crusader,

> be helpful without being patronizing, be dedicated but not involved. He must want to help not out of duty or because of social pressure or personal advantages, but because of his commitment as an educator. On the other hand, his smaller college colleague also must recognize that his university counterpart must find satisfactions from his physical, mental, and, yes, emotional involvement in the exchange, and that change is the consequence of successful effort. Tact, understanding, humility, wisdom, effort, patience: these are the ingredients for a successful exchange, at once the goals of effective teaching and meaningful living.

A third problem of cooperative programs is the difficulty which predominantly Negro colleges experience in obtaining extended services of top-flight exchange professors. The colleges find it relatively easy to schedule these scholars as lecturers or as consultants for a day or two but hard to do so for a regular or summer term. Similar to this problem is the difficulty in retaining young white teachers as faculty members on a permanent basis. These individuals generally remain at the predominantly Negro colleges for two or three years and then move on to positions at predominantly white institutions. The best possible results of cooperative programs will never be realized until more white teachers spend longer periods of time as faculty members at predominantly Negro colleges.

Now let us consider some of the advantages of cooperative programs.

Perhaps the chief advantage is that these arrangements open a new area of service for universities. In their preoccupation with multitudes, machines, and money, many large institutions have neglected humanistic concerns. By establishing interinstitutional relationships with smaller and less wealthy schools which are handicapped by discrimination and segregation, universities gain the opportunity to discover new channels for the expression of human commitment.

Another advantage of cooperative programs is that they enable students, faculty members, and administrators in colleges and universities to enrich their learning and teaching experiences through exposure to radically different institutions. In student exchanges, students in the predominantly Negro college get the experience of studying in a large university and making firsthand arrangements for graduate work, while university students gain knowledge and understanding that accrue from attending a small school with a predominantly Negro enrollment. In faculty exchanges, professors have the opportunity to go to another campus as lecturers or consultants, as directors of seminars and workshops, or as teachers for a summer or regular session. Some university professors give colleges valuable assistance in revising departmental curricula, improving library services, and planning new buildings. Teachers at predominantly Negro colleges also have the opportunity to undertake joint research projects and to do short-term non-degree or pre-doctoral study at cooperating universities. In administrative exchanges, administrators gain the benefits of conferring with colleagues and inspecting administrative policies and procedures. College administrators also have the opportunity to do graduate study at cooperating universities. Since administrators usually do not enjoy sabbatical leaves, these exchanges provide excellent opportunities to observe operations on another campus.

Another advantage of cooperative programs is that they give predominantly Negro colleges the opportunity to recruit talented young teachers. Since college representatives have contacts on university campuses, they can conveniently engage qualified National Teaching Fellows as well as graduate students seeking the master's or doctor's degree.

In brief, through cooperative prorams the predominantly Negro college is not only strengthening its own educational programs and providing wider experiences for its own community but also is broadening the social and cultural perspectives of staff and student personnel in a large university. As Dr. James A. Perkins, President of Cornell University, observed in discussing the Hampton-Cornell exchange, "This program of joint enrichment on all levels will give administrators, faculty, and students at both institutions a view of an unfamiliar educational area."

But the most encouraging result of cooperative programs is the strong indication that these pilot projects will provide models of reciprocal enrichment that will benefit not only predominantly Negro colleges and related universities but also offer small colleges and cooperating universities without regard to race or region, thereby adding a new and important dimension to higher education in the United States and throughout the world.

INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION: A PROFESSOR'S WORM'S EYE VIEW

Cecil L. Patterson
Chairman, Wisconsin Liaison Committee
North Carolina College

The University of Wisconsin, North Carolina College at Durham, North Carolina Agricultural and Technical College (Greensboro), and Texas Southern University (Houston) began in 1964 an experiment in interinstitutional cooperation. Financed by a $300,000 grant from the Carnegie Corporation, the activity was a Faculty Exchange Program designed to permit the three smaller institutions to draw upon the resources of The University of Wisconsin in order to strengthen their weak areas and to achieve an over-all improvement in their programs and activities. While, in my view as a member of the North Carolina College Liaison Committee, this is not precisely what happened, enough has occurred to enable us to discover some of the important factors that affect interinstitutional programs and perhaps to suggest some directions for such activities in the future.

North Carolina College is a small institution of some 150 full time faculty members and 3,000 students. Those of us engaged in the operation of the Exchange Program soon found that this small size exerted major effects on the program. The immediate impact was the difficulty in finding someone to handle the new program. Everyone was already fully engaged. Who could take on the Exchange Program? The reflex action of forming a committee merely diffused the difficulty. Who could serve on the new committee? Clearly, the activities of this program were in the domain of the College Agency for Planning and Development, but we had no such agency. Thus, although our portion of the operating funds amounted to only $90,000, this amount loomed large in view of the limited resources we had to deal with it.

The Committee, of course, was duly formed (and named the Wisconsin Liaison Committee). The main question seemed clear: "Who at NCC should be exchanged for whom at UW?" The answers were something else. Obviously, the exchange should strengthen the weak departments or areas. But when is a department weak? To a dean, it may be weak if its chairman lacks the doctorate and the accrediting agency says he should have one. If one points out that this particular department serves fewer than 100 students, it may still remain weak in the eyes of that dean. To a department chairman, an area may be weak if it lacks a specialist in a given area. Which weaknesses are most important? Everybody in the art department knows that the weaknesses in art are most important; each expert in biology knows that the problems in biology deserve priority, and to those in chemistry, the need for strengthening chemistry is so paramount as to brook no discussion. Clearly, we needed an over-all program of our past procedures, future directions, and allocation of our resources in order to decide who should be exchanged. But we did not have the people to cope with present problems; interpreting past ones, or discovering future difficulties to deal with was out of the question.

Other effects appeared. There was no money. Like our people, our funds were tied up in present operations. There was nothing available for discretionary projects or for planning procedures. The financial needs were modest--some secretarial help, a few supplies, and some hours of released time so that someone could stop and think coherently about the program and its implications. The secretarial problem was solved by piling the work on the existing load (and waiting until it could be done); the supplies were "obtained," but the essential planning functions had to be postponed until the grant funds became available. Hence, we spent most of the first year planning instead of operating.

When the Liaison Committee finally began functioning, it learned that small institutions are easily upset. Both deans, who were also members of the committee--were changed. Since we did not have a blueprint for our future activities, or a program for the allocation of our resources, the change in deans meant redefinition of "weak" and "strong" and a consequent delay in deciding the activities of the Exchange Program. I do not mean to imply that wholesale changes are a function of smallness. I do mean that smallness leads to a lack of formalized planning for the establishment of over-all goals and allocation of resources and that in the absence of the established procedure, individuals make these determinations. Thus, when the individual changes, the definitions he has established change also.

This instability makes it difficult to achieve the sense of perspective necessary to mount long range programs. Like those of most people, our horizons tended to be limited to our borders. But the exchange program demanded looking beyond those limits. Possible benefits and probable disadvantages had to be viewed in terms of years rather than months, and the field of endeavor had to include not only NCC but UW as well. We never did fully master this transition. Instead of a three year program, we developed three one-year programs whose relations with each other consisted primarily in that they were developed by the same institution.

If smallness limited resources and decreased stability, it furnished an abundant measure of fear of domination. Elaborate provisions were built into every proposal to insure that NCC was not dominated by UW. Just why UW would want to dominate NCC and just what UW would do with NCC if such domination should occur was never quite clear. But Big Brother lurked just around the corner, and he had to be kept outside at all costs. This fear led to an insistence on equality where none existed and made an effective faculty exchange impossible. Our faculty members who lacked the terminal degree were to pursue that degree at UW and be replaced here by UW faculty members. But by what kind of UW faculty member? We were sending assistant professors; the logic of "equality" demanded that the replacement be also at least an assistant professor. But at UW, assistant professors already have terminal degrees. Many mental gymnastics were performed trying to devise a formula. Finally it was agreed that the replacement should be a "faculty member," i. e., not "some graduate student." That this settlement overlooks the reality that in the larger perspective of UW, the faculty member we were sending would be "some graduate student," hardly needs to be pointed out. That we subsequently employed as replacements people with the same qualifications as the UW graduate student would have had merely illustrates the lengths to which fear of domination can drive an institution.

Small size is not the only factor that affected the Exchange Program. UW is predominantly white; NCC is predominantly Negro. Not only must Big Brother be kept at his distance; the Great White Father must be locked out also. The effects of racial pride, distrust, and fear have been detailed too often to go into their dreary catalog of effects here. They made it difficult, if not impossible, for us to take advantage of UW's greater experience in any real evaluation of our proposals. If a proposal verged on lunacy, the most we could expect would be a politely incredulous, "Are you sure this is what you really want to do?" "Should you do this?" was never permitted to arise.

Like most small, predominantly Negro colleges, NCC is a "developing" or "underdeveloped" institution. In these organizations appearance is important. Hence, the Exchange Program was pressed to produce highly visible results. "Senior" scholars were demanded of UW, or newsworthy places for the NCC faculty members at UW. Then, when these were not immediately forthcoming, the before-mentioned suspicion and distrust arose. In these organizations, centralized management is the typical form of control. Decisions on the Exchange Program could not be made at the point of contact, but had to be referred to the chief executive; hence long waits between questions from UW and answers from NCC occurred. The centralized management was often paternalistic. Paternalism produces both people who resent it and those who need it. One group would embroil the Exchange Program in the solution to the wrong problem; the other would avoid participating in it at all. Neither could be regarded as an asset to the program.

All these factors--size, race, underdevelopment--impeded communication and caused misunderstanding. Both UW and NCC used the same terms, but did not mean the same thing by them. Both agreed to stress faculty improvement, but NCC defined faculty improvement primarily as the attainment of the terminal degree; to UW the term meant primarily up-dating, refreshment, or refurbishment. Both concepts are valid, but they channel resources in different directions. As a result of the interaction of all these factors, the UW-NCC Exchange Program developed primarily into a means of providing further graduate training for the NCC faculty, and its major activity at NCC turned into developing fair methods of selecting people to obtain the training.

This is not to say that the program has failed. Under its auspices two NCC faculty members have received two years of graduate training, nine have received one year, and two have received a summer of graduate study. Of these, five have completed their course work and preliminary examinations for the terminal degree. Three of these five appear likely to receive the degree in June. Six faculty members have attended short term ~~institutes,~~ and one has taught in a UW program.

Cooperative research activities have resulted in successful applications for federally financed Institutes for Teachers of Disadvantaged Children and in programs for mutual use of facilities such as library materials and closed circuit television. The UW placement service has been made available to aid NCC in the search for faculty personnel. NCC is now included in the recruiting activities of some UW graduate programs. Though specifically exempted from the Exchange Program, student exchanges have sprung up as a peripheral activity so that six NCC students are now attending various units of the UW system and three of the UW system studnets have just returned to their home campus after a semester at NCC.

A pervasive result is the widening of horizons of those at NCC who have been in immediate contact with UW system. The receiving of information, the observation of working solutions to pressing problems, the infection with the attitude that problems are made to be solved, and the widening of horizons that can put present problems in perspective are salubrious in themselves. The problem with intangible benefits, of course, is that they must be taken on faith. The fact that the NCC student services began a continuing reorganization shortly after the dean of students spent an intensive session at UW, and that most of the new features bear a strong resemblance to UW procedures may indicate that this faith is not misplaced.

The question is thus not so much whether the UW-NCC program failed as whether the same results could have been achieved better in another way or whether some better results could have been achieved in the present way. Or, "Where do cooperative programs go from here?"

Faculty improvement--in all senses of the term--is a possible direction. Sometimes a program cannot be accredited unless it is headed by a person with a terminal degree. Providing someone with that degree while the person in charge obtains his makes obvious sense. Such exchanges involve high salary expense. The heavy teaching loads in the smaller institutions mean that at least two persons from the larger institution will be needed to replace the outgoing person. Displacement allowances will be needed for the incoming people. Since opportunities for research will be limited, a hardship allowance will also be necessary. The total for such activities can run to $40,000 per year for a single exchange.

The need of the smaller institutions for faculty members with the terminal degree will continue. They cannot compete for these people on the open market. They can grow them; but, lacking graduate schools of their own, must send them to other institutions. In theory, the cooperative exchange arrangement could solve this problem easily by having the larger institution accept the faculty members as students and furnish replacements from its own resources. In practice, flaws develop. Many of the selectees will already have accumulated so many hours at other schools that to switch would result in hardship and loss ot time. Inflated ideas of equality hamper the substitution of graduate students for the outgoing faculty members. The cost is high also--about $15,000 per exchangee per year.

Filling the need for people with terminal degrees is likely to be the major bone of contention in future cooperative programs. The smaller school must show these degrees in its catalog in order to survive. The teacher must have his "union card" for his own advancement and security. For both, "Faculty Improvement" thus means the achievement of the terminal degree. Whether cooperative programs are the best way to solve this problem remains to be seen.

The appearance of the faculties may be changed also by a direct exchange of one teacher for another. Whether this change is improvement can be debated. When it is improvement, its cost needs to be examined. Can an outstanding teacher at a smaller institution do more good by transferring to the larger one? The famous teacher at the larger institution teaches so few calsses that in the smaller school someone has to be employed to teach while he is being famous. This situation runs the costs of the exchange to the $40, 000 level. Such exchanges are highly visible and are thus dear to the hearts of those who need to point to accomplishments without specifying results.

A fertile opportunity exists for short term study. Summer programs, short term institutes, workshops, and conferences offer means of improving the skills of teachers without disrupting their private plans and without disturbing their progress toward the all-important terminal degree. The cost is usually low since salaries are not involved. Administration is simple because no replacements are necessary. The areas covered can be as wide as the interests of the individual teachers.

A comparatively unexplored possibility is mangement techniques. The larger institution can offer short term institutes, courses, and on-the-job experiences. Consultation is also a possibility. Personnel exchanges on a position-for-position basis can be considered. The problem is time for the manager to attend the activities. The more effective the manager is--the less he needs the help--the more time he is likely to have. The least effective manager--who needs the help most--will have less time to avail himself of the aid. How does one tell a manager that he is the problem?

Program development and improvement is another important direction. The larger institution has experts in various programs. Often they have already developed solutions to the problems the smaller school is trying to solve. If they have not, at least they have developed procedures for solving the problem. Bringing the two groups together could be a fruitful activity for cooperative programs.

Cooperative research offers another avenue. One of the major problems of the day is how to deal with disadvantaged students. UW exerts strenuous efforts to lure these students. These students exert strenuous efforts to enter NCC. Cooperative research offers a way to get the researchers and the raw material together.

Joint use of facilities is still another possibility. This capaability is extended by the fact that closed circuit television and other mass media enable the sharing of facilities by institutions not physically in proximity.

Student exchanges form perhaps the most promising and at the same time most neglected avenue for interinstitutional cooperation. In the small institution, everything culminates in the student. An improved faculty and administration can give the student only what he is willing to accept. Student motives and aspirations can be conditioned far more effectively by students than by faculty and administration members. Student exchanges form one of the most economical and direct means of effecting desirable changes in motives and aspirations. Ten student exchanges can be arranged for the price of one of the least expensive faculty exchanges.

No matter which avenue the future cooperative programs take, certain guidelines seem clear. Realistic, attainable goals must be set up and understood. Establishment of such goals will help minimize the floundering about and the misunderstandings. No institution has surplus Ph. D. 's; nor can those it has be ordered to participate in a cooperative activity. To embark upon a program that demands the services of large numbers of such people is certain to cause broken promises with the consequent reawakening of the fear and mistrust that always lurk beneath the surface of the cooperative exterior.

An appreciation of the time factors needs to be developed. Cooperative programs are time consuming. Lines of communication have to be opened; communication itself has to occur. What is meant by what is said must be determined. People must be persuaded to change established patterns of operating. Mechanisms for control and coordination must be set up. For a long time, nothing seems to be happening. The uninitiated can easily become discouraged. Even when things do begin to happen, the time stretches out. If the goal is the attainment of terminal degrees, the minimum length of the program will need to be three years (perhaps four would be better). Clearly, these are not programs where the race is to the swift.

Finally, adequate financing must be provided. The programs are expensive, but adequacy must be not only in terms of amounts. It must be in terms of understanding the nature of the risks involved and the rewards to be expected. Not every doctoral candidate receives the coveted degree; programs do not always accomplish their intended purpose; research does not always find positive answers, and sponsors can be left with nothing to show for their money but receipts.

The nature of these risks and problems demands that private funds be heavily involved. With the advent of Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, private foundations have tended to withdraw from financing cooperative programs in line with the axiom that once the federal money moves in, theirs moves out. This withdrawal indicates an incomplete understanding of the problem. Aside from the fact that Title III is the one title of HEA 1965 whose life has to be extended by congressional action, many of the difficulties at which cooperative programs are directed are not amenable to solution by government financing. Government agencies tend to finance what is politically feasible. Long range programs such as study leading toward the terminal degree, for example, aside from being highly risky, do not lend themselves to the kind of reporting that makes good reading on an agency's record to Congress. What would happen if someone should wonder publicly, "Why should this teacher have his education subsidized by my tax money just because he works in a developing institution?" The lack of Title III grants for this activity indicates a possible understanding of this consequence. One further example will suffice. At a recent conference a federal official pointed out that his agency had denied a proposal for an institutional self-study. He commented, "We can't give you money to find out what to ask for." Yet this kind of money is a crying need of the smaller institutions. These institutions do not know what to ask for, nor do they have the resources to find out. An enlightened financing of enough cooperative programs for them to make this discovery is one way to spread the accumulated wisdom and skills of the larger, established institutions to the smaller underdeveloped ones.

Interinstitutional programs of cooperation represent one attempt to solve some of the pressing problems in higher education. They offer a way to translate good intention into action. They are as fraught with dangers and difficulties as they are replete with opportunities and rewards. After three years of struggling with the University of Wisconsin-North Carolina College Exchange Program, would I engage in another one?

Yes.

II THE NATURE OF INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

PERSPECTIVES ON INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

Overarching occasional misgivings about specific projects, this evaluation by actual participants in the foregoing chapter is an enthusiastic endorsement of the Title III program. There is general optimism about the value of interinstitutional cooperation. Dr. Player underlines the "institutional vitality" engendered by these exchanges; Dr. Pitts sees the cooperative idea as gaining wide acceptance in the world of higher education; Dr. Gloster stressed the opportunity that cooperation brings for emphasizing humanistic values; and Dr. Patterson - perhaps most encouraging of all - outlines the frustrations in mounting a specific project but then hastens to add that he would gladly do it again!

The 84 projects launched in 1966-67 under Title III can only be given a preliminary evaluation, but at this point they represent "creative possibilities". In extending aid to the smaller colleges, cooperative efforts open up opportunities for people from, what President Pitts termed "the educational wastelands of this country". Although many of the Title III programs coupled small Negro colleges in the South with white northern universities, the idea of linking institutions of varying strengths and interests has great relevance for the whole of higher education. The achievement of integration in higher education, however, is an important goal in itself. Conference participants agreed that the cooperative device was exciting because it provided new vistas for all including the most prestigious colleges and universities in the country.

Additional insights on interinstitutional cooperation came to the surface during informal discussion periods. The lively dialogue between conference participants was itself an example of fruitful exchange between developing and established institutions. It brought out many of the nuances which must be mastered if cooperation is to take place.

From the discussions, two perspectives emerged: the point of view of developing institutions regarding cooperation, and the viewpoint of established institutions. Some of these comments are reproduced below in an effort to further illuminate on the complexities of cooperation.

FROM THE DEVELOPING POINT OF VIEW

1. We Have Needs

Basis for Cooperation

> Interinstitutional cooperation has its best chance of getting started when there is either an element of crisis or need. Under these circumstances, the developing institution is stimulated to look for new ways to overcome its problems. At the crisis level, cooperation is occasionally sought because an institution has become panicky about accreditation. On a higher level, an institution may look beyond its campus in order to put in motion a creative idea.

A Diversity of Needs

I don't think anybody, in Title III or otherwise, has really attempted to understand the kinds of problems we have. The very fact that one solution can be felt to be appropriate for all our problems indicates that our problems are not clearly understood. Most people will agree that the Negro colleges are different from white ones even though they don't know what this difference consists of. Not too many people realize however, that Negro colleges differ from each other, and thus differences are so great that these institutions can't communicate with each other in the same language.

Not being understood puts you on the defensive, and you can't do much cooperating because you're too busy defending yourself. If you ask for help, you're admitting that there's something wrong with you. On the other hand, if you are secure enough to admit that you have some faults and want to cure them, you also have to have the understanding of others to bring cooperation about.

The third thing to consider is that many of these schools need massive aid in every sense of the word. I can see that at our college, for example, we could have bilateral arrangements in some areas, multilateral arrangements in other areas, and just plain funding in still others.

Racial Factor Adds Complications

We have repeatedly made unsuccessful overtures to set up normal intercollegiate relations with______ and ______college which is just 30 miles from our school. We have a kind of cultural isolation from ______and ______because we are a predominantly Negro college. If we were predominantly white, we would have more or less normal relations--so in that degree we are culturally isolated.

Racial Problems Obscure Professional Relations

It's hard to get around the feeling held by the small that they will be taken over by those who are bigger.

Secondly, since almost all of these big institutions are also white, you've also got the race problem. Well intentioned white people are, in the minds of many Negroes, even worse than bad intentioned white people, because then you have an added professional problem. Who wants to admit that he's inferior, that he needs upgrading? Most Negro teachers are on the defensive. They feel they are doing something that professionally they ought not to be doing. They recognize this discrepancy because most of them have been trained in the white university. They have had the tendency to teach their students the same way they themselves were taught, but experience has shown that these methods won't work. They then drop back to something that they think will work which they label as less than college, and they don't want anybody to find this out. Unless these very real attitudes can be altered, exchange is going to be extremely difficult.

2. But We Also Have a Contribution to Make!

Rewards Are Reciprocal

Even though the 'have not' colleges offer little immediately, established universities should recognize that they will eventually receive much from the exchange, provided they are open to what the developing colleges have to offer. Many side effects are possible and can be of considerable importance. Take Dartmouth's decision to cooperate with Talladega. Talladega was given a computer and it appeared that it might become a white elephant. Through a personal relationship, the president of Talladega explored a possible link with Dartmouth in order to develop a program in mathematics in which the computer would play a major role. A group of Dartmouth professors were released to go to Talladega for a year to develop the course in math in cooperation with the talladega faculty. This turned out to be a fruitful exchange as significant new teaching techniques resulted. A second spin-off came because the faculty exchange stimulated Talladega students to enroll at Dartmouth. In this development, the Dartmouth faculty gained valuable experience in teaching Negro Students.

Methods Must Fit Situations

My constant fear is that the new educational technology will mean materials beamed at people whose needs are quite different from those upon whom they were perfected. I'm talking about the great masses of students in college who more than the latest discovery need learning situations which focus on social understanding and social responsibility. A new technology is appropriate if it promotes this result and the small college has a contribution to make to the humanizing of education.

Established Should Build On Developing Norms

I can pinpoint the essential ingredient in one effective cooperative arrangement. Very essential to its success was the fact that the established institution, despite its excellent academic reputation, resisted the temptation to bring in its own preconceived idea of quality in education--which generally means the charge for us to strive to be like our helpers. Rather, they accepted the developing institution's students with their 25-35 percentile academic norms as an opportunity to try the educationally unusual. This has been tremendously productive precisely because they decided to go our way. Our students set the academic measure for the cooperative program. As a result, new learning techniques had to be developed at our institution, some of which are now being used at the established university.

Human Exchange is Necessary

When you get right down to it, cooperation is a matter of human relations, the opportunity for people to get to know each other better as people. A profound mutual respect for people, not for institutions, must be the result. I wish we could change the focus from that of an institutional interchange to a human dialogue. The real answer is to develop a network in which we can talk to each other any time we want.

Respect is Basic

I can't help but think that the problems are basically psychological, ones of dependency and negative self-image. I'm therefore not sure that an additional $100,000 really speaks to these difficulties. Not until the advanced institutions come to see in the developing colleges qualities that they really need will much progress be made. Money won't make the essential difference. The promotion of respect for those who are different is the primary mission of Title III.

FROM THE ESTABLISHED POINT OF VIEW

1. We Can Be of Help

Advice to Developing Schools

I think that the developing colleges ought to first look at the job market that is open to their students. They should then gear their offerings in such a way that students will have expanded job opportunities. Particular attention should be paid to the mounting obsolescence of specific kinds of skills.

Other Approaches

If you knew you had $30 million to improve these kinds of institutions, you could devise several tested ways to proceed. One could be to divide the money equally and simply put the checks in the mail to the presidents. A second way would be to make available an internship program similar to the one sponsored by the American Council on Education. A third way would be to take some of the better people and send them to some place like Dr. Algo Henderson's Center for the Study of Higher Education. A fourth way might involve asking the professional societies to aid the faculty or to use ESI to provide them with summer institutes. A fifth possibility would be to support the Woodrow Wilson Southern

Teaching Program in order that new faculty would be available. A sixth way would be to improve their fund raising capacity as the Phelps-Stokes Fund has pioneered. The seventh way would be interinstitutional cooperation on a bilateral basis. I think we can agree, the last method is not the only way.

Established Benefits Are Secondary

Now, I think it must be frankly recognized that the primary benefits go to the developing institution. I realize that there is a great psychological problem here. Perhaps it doesn't exist with the small Catholic colleges that are coming in under the wire on this program, but I think that it does exist with the Negro colleges. I have run into it, on the Tuskegee campus in its relationship with the University of Michigan. There is a feeling that, after all, the cooperation did not involve mutuality of respect and treatment. I think we'll do much better if we frankly recognize that these are developing situations into which you are bringing experts who are to be fully utilized, rather than assuming some purely mutual arrangement.

Negro Students Bypass Established Schools

Some years ago, a sociology professor from Howard University conducted a study on the Negro in higher education in New York State. He discovered that something like 60 percent of the Negro youths from New York were going out of the state to southern Negro colleges. As reasons, students cited their search for a congenial social environment, the desire to be involved in student government, to be active socially on the campus, to have a chance to be editor of the paper. The finding was a revelation. It was shocking to learn that although the door to higher education in New York was very wide open to Negro students, they were not taking advantage of it. I don't know whether the situation has changed. I would suppose there has been a gradual increase in the number of Negroes. But that doesn't mean that they are integrated. They may still be segregated within our respective campus

We Will Profit Too

Cooperation with weaker institutions doesn't mean that the senior institution doesn't get some advantages. A great deal of recognition has come for extension work and continuing education efforts. No good medical school today would think of confining its program to the students enrolled at the medical school. They reach out and try to stimulate the practising physicians offering courses on human health and welfare. It may be that the situation of the Negro in the United States makes it an important function of institutions of higher education which have greater resources to share some of these resources for the sake of the social benefit that comes from it. Putting these institutions into the mainstream will bring its own rewards and the established institutions should approach this task wholeheartedly.

2. But Do We Really Have What is Needed?

Place Stress on Innovation

There are other implications to programs of cooperative relationships. I would suggest a law of leaping development. It isn't necessary for a college that's coming along to go through and repeat every mistake made over the past 50 years in the large university. Should we not look at developing institutions a little more experimentally, concentrating on their capability rather than their present condition? This would place the emphasis on innovation, and as a consequence larger gains might occur.

Integration Enriches Curriculum

Wilberforce is next door to us, and we have discovered that we benefited greatly from a recent arrangement. We now admit Wilberforce students to Antioch classes, when the teacher is willing to take the increased number. We have a course called "cross-cultural experiences," required of all students planning to go abroad. This is a much better

> course now that we have this mixed enrollment between the two institutions.
>
> Avoid Condescension
>
> I've been a little disturbed by the condescension toward the so-called developing schools. One of the best comments I've heard is that every institution is either developing or decaying. Nobody is standing still. I feel that lots of the big institutions are decadent, and to a greater extent than they realize. I've admitted this quite often, as far as New York University is concerned, but I think it applies to Michigan, Wisconsin, and many other schools. I'm even more confident that there are decadent elements and developing elements in virtually every institution. The upshot of this is that we must look upon these other colleges simply as smaller schools and not as poor schools.

The candid observations above give penetrating glimpses into the nature of interinstitutional cooperation. The discussions brought into the open some of the fears and hesitancies of both groups and helped pave the way for mutual understanding. It was agreed that though developing schools can expect to make substantial gains through cooperation, the established schools too will benefit from the exchange.

What can the developing schools give to the advanced institutions that already "have everything?" The developing schools can provide: a different setting in which to educate; an untapped source of graduate students; an atmosphere where the emphasis is upon teaching as antidote for the "publish or perish" syndrome; a more appropriate setting for some students from the advanced institution; the opportunity for educational innovation in a setting which the established school cannot duplicate, and a middle ground where experimentation can take place which would otherwise be unacceptable in either the advanced or the developing situation alone.

In the discussions as in the more formal conference program, it was indicated that interinstitutional cooperation can work provided the exchange is a two-way relationship. Cooperation must not be marred by slavish imitation on the part of the developing schools or condescension on the part of the stronger institutions. Mutual understanding and dialogue will result in the "reciprocal enrichment" that will overflow into the educational mainstream.

INTRODUCTION: TOWARD A THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

It's remarkable how little is known about interinstitutional cooperation. The literature is extremely limited and difficult to locate. That which exists is much more descriptive than analytical. The problem is partly one of definition to determine what interinstitutional cooperation covers and what it does not. Existing taxonomies are largely descriptive and do not rest on solid empirical studies.

Nonetheless, the pressures for cooperation are mounting. Enrollments, rising costs, and the explosion of knowledge exert pressures for cooperation, but so also do the quest for quality in instruction, the desire for expanded graduate education, the opportunities for sophisticated research, expanded interest in the non-Western world, plus many factors that are beyond the individual campuses: governmental initiatives at all levels, foundation and business forces--all of which lead colleges to link together. These patterns emerge in a survey of the literature.

The need to study the process of interinstitutional cooperation is great. We don't as yet understand what is happening, let alone have the means for directing change in higher education. The fundamental need is for a theoretical framework. Daniel Katz offers an approach by extrapolating systems theory from business research and applying it to higher education. Universities are open systems, he asserts, and this is both their strength and the threat to their existence. Openness has brought undersirable intrusions from the environment, such as non-educational demands from government and business. Faculty, with dual memberships in their respective disciplines as well as the university, are uncommitted to individual institutions and often are overloaded. The function of inquiry, a central function for the university, has also led to a loose organizational structure in which decisions are often made through progressive commitment. Responsibility is not lodged where decisions are really made.

When seen as open systems, certain implications emerge for the movement toward greater interinstitutional cooperation. The inadequacy of the feedback mechanisms, both energic and informational, stand out. The relevance of large units breaking into smaller parts is highlighted as necessary to preserve certain university functions. Moreover, the importance of understanding the environment, and especially the super-system of which the university may be a part, becomes clearer. A better understanding of these and other factors which systems theory highlights will help in an understanding of interinstitutional cooperation and will also suggest ways in which the process can be directed productively to achieve specific goals.

One direction in which interinstitutional cooperation is directed under Title III of the Higher Education Act is the improvement of academic quality in developing institutions. Robert McGinnis has conceptualized the steps that are involved in understanding the dynamics of quality and applying to it some quantifiable measures. He suggests the use of stochastic process theory. The first task is to construct an appropriate yardstick. An elastic scale, properly partitioned, would be difficult to construct, but could be accomplished with the aid of the right panel of experts. Institutional factors could provide criteria for quality and factor analysis solutions could weight them. The use of probability vectors and Markovian Chain Analysis could then establish tentative measures of the direction and rate of quality change of a given institution relative to the field of institutions in higher education. The information such a procedure would make available would be rich and would provide suggestions regarding which institutions should be supported and to what extent.

The problems involved are also enormous as one proceeds to move from the world of mathematics to the world of higher education. But the mathematical model points the way to a much more sophisticated use of information than has characterized the past. What it suggested for the Office of Education is the possibility of embarking on the task of collecting and calibrating the vast amount of information that it annually collects. And since the need is to see the field of higher education, perhaps only the Office of Education has the necessary resources.

Clearly the information at hand is inadequate if one takes seriously Daniel Katz' notions about open systems and the manner in which a given college is in an energic feedback system with its environment. Needed is much more information about the setting in which developing colleges find themselves. This suggests to the author the possibility of a partnership between the Office of Education and the colleges seeking funds under the Developing Colleges Program. The search to determine who the developing are and to ascertain their needs can be pursued productively if one moves under the conceptions of systems analysis and attempts to develop the mathematical model Robert McGinnis has set forth. The task will be complex,but seems possible, at least in theory. The promise would be a much more rational policy of development which could be constantly refined and improved.

But are universities open systems? Daniel Katz suggests they are and illustrates feedback systems in the Tuskegee-Michigan program. But others raise questions about the difficulties of entering and leaving higher education; they cite class barriers within universities and the one-way track in the Tuskegee-Michigan program.

This also led to a discussion of what inputs could produce sustained change in the developing institutions. Particular attention was focused on the role of the state coordinating systems as examples of highly relevant super-systems into which the developing colleges were placed.

SURVEY AND ANALYSIS OF THE LITERATURE RELATED TO INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Lawrence C. Howard
Director, Institute of Human Relations
The University of Wisconsin

I. SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE*

Introduction

Interinstitutional cooperation, as it is labeled, enjoys wide acceptance among college administrators as a device for overcoming mounting problems, and cooperative programs linking institutions of higher education are multiplying. In the face of its popularity it is remarkable how little is known about the movement. This assessment covers the available literature and points to frontiers for research and development that should receive support from foundations and from the public.

Although numerous discussions of interinstitutional cooperation exist, finding them is a problem. One's approach to Books in Print, periodical indexes, Dissertation Abstracts, government documents, and the New York Times must be highly imaginative, since interinstitutional main entries and cross references are undeveloped. More helpful are uncited ephemera: brochures, proposals, conference reports, program evaluations, and letters. An appropriate classification systen and a clearinghouse for current relevant materials on interinstitutional cooperation are badly needed, and the American Council on Education, the National Council of Churches, and the Committee on Institutional Cooperation of the Big Ten and the University of Chicago all have urged the establishment of such a service.

---

* The author would like to express his indebtedness to Mrs. Robert Nero and Miss Ruth Nielsen for their assistance in the preparation of this paper.

Valuable information can be abstracted from standard higher education reference works: the comprehensive professional source book, The College Blue Book, reissued every three years; Lovejoy's Guide, directed to the student's interest and updated annually; and the ACE's American Universities and Colleges, which comes out quadrennially.[1] State, regional, and nationally collected statistics are available,[2] and additional information can be gleaned from the more generalized reports of state governments and private foundations.

Although these works contain duplications, often give conflicting information, and are unstandardized as to nomenclature, they nonetheless provide significant longitudinal data on colleges participating in cooperative programs. If standardized and carefully analyzed, these continuing data would be of great value in helping to increase support for cooperative programs.

Information is also generated by the roughly 90 departments, centers, or sets of courses on higher education, such as the ones at Teachers College of Columbia University, New York University, Ohio State University, Southern Illinois University, the University of California at Berkeley, Florida State University, and the University of Michigan. But these centers, as Arthur J. Dibden has pointed out, need strengthening and should have an interdisciplinary framework. Faculty and students need to be drawn from areas other than schools of education; curriculum and research should be more concerned with the context of higher education and less with internal administrative matters.[3] These improvements could be promoted by additional support made available on the pattern and in the magnitude now set up for the U.S. Office of Education's Research and Demonstration Centers.

For better perspectives on interinstitutional cooperation, it is necessary to examine works outside the field of education per se. Works which open new vistas are David Riesman's assessment of institutional attitudes and behavior; Robert J. Havighurst's analysis of four-year colleges as shaped by the forces of economy, demography, and ideology; and Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson's construct of radical-liberal and conservative-reactionary models for two-year institutions.[4] Other valuable works are Talcott Parson's analytical tools for viewing education as a social system, and André Danière's projections of higher education as a major consumer and producer.[5] This reference to works with a social science orientation clearly underscores just how productive a broader perspective would be. We also need to delve into the utopian literature for perspective: the critical issue is to reconcile the "ideology of the university" with the organizational and administrative forms and patterns that higher education seems destined to take. For example, the "ideology" embraces the personalized student-faculty relationship, the development and worth of the individual, and the activation of social concern and involvement; yet our institutions increasingly become more massive, depersonalized, fragmented, and obscure in purpose.[6]

While the descriptive literature on interinstitutional cooperation is extensive, assessments of programs are few. Portrayals of successes, apparently prepared to please funding agencies, predominate. Little is recorded on interaction between colleges, its duration, intensity, or significance. Even less is known about the response of participating faculty members, administrators, or students. There is almost nothing on the results for society achieved through cooperative effort.

The recorded literature, in short, permits only a sketchy overview of interinstitutional cooperation. Of one thing, however, we can be sure--higher education has become a major American industry, and as in big business, its executives are talking about combinations to achieve greater efficiency and economy. "What captivates the educational world now," Eldon Johnson has said, ". . . is this essential new possibility. It lies between isolated independence and complete merger. It is a vehicle to cope with problems readily perceived as common . . . ."[7]

Historical Background of Interinstitutional Cooperation

Cooperation among colleges is not new. It predates the Oxford-Cambridge arrangements; the University of Sankori at Timbuktu exchanged professors with Moorish University as early as A.D. 600.[8] In the United States, Cornell University entered a cooperative enterprise in 1894 through contractual arrangements with New York State. By 1904 the relationship was a mutual investment and symbiotic in nature.[9] Elsewhere over the same period such major contiguous institutions as Harvard and M.I.T. cooperated by informally agreeing to pursue quite separate academic emphases.

Major interest in promoting institutional cooperation among existing colleges began around World War I as a result of John D. Rockefeller's support of the General Education Board's work in higher education for Negroes. Consolidations were projected as a way to achieve economies. The board unsuccessfully attempted to bring Fisk University and Meharry Medical College together, but it did succeed in reorganizing Straight University, New Orleans University, and Flint-Goodridge Hospital as

Dillard University. Initial cooperation between Spelman College and Morehouse College in 1921 came to fruition in 1929 when John Hope, then president of Morehouse, accepted the presidency of a newly created Atlanta University. The Ponoma College cluster system was initiated by president James A. Bliesdell in 1923 as a direct reproduction of the Oxford pattern. In the early thirties cooperative acquisition of library holdings was begun between the University of North Carolina and Duke; at the same time Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore initiated some interdependent activities. In the Nashville area Vanderbilt University, George Peabody College, and Scarritt College had unified their libraries by the late thirties. The University Center in Georgia was founded in 1940 as an effort to bring together faculty members in what are now eight institutions, and in 1945 Radcliffe students began to get the bulk of their instruction in the same classes with Harvard men.[10]

For the period since World War II, Algo Henderson has documented cycles of collaboration: first, cooperation to accommodate returning veterans, then competition when the bulge of students slimmed, and finally renewed cooperation as enrollments surged again.[11] Some of the highlights of this period are well known. The University Center in Virginia was founded in 1946, and the Manhattan District--a cooperative program which developed the atomic bomb--in the same year spawned Argonne National Laboratory cooperative programs. The Hill Family

Foundation established a cooperative program for Hamline, Macalester, St. Thomas, and St. Catherine Colleges in Minnesota in 1953. The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges was a coalition of colleges passed over by the Ford Foundation in its distribution of $260 million to 630 institutions in 1955.[12]

The Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) was formed in 1954, inspiring formation of a similar group, the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education (WICHE). As a countermove to prevent a compulsory regional compact for the midwestern states, the Committee for Institutional Cooperation of the Big Ten and the University of Chicago (CIC) was begun in 1957 with a major grant from the Cornegie Foundation.[13]

Cooperative involvement by urban institutions in community problems was a theme of the Louisville meeting of the Association of Urban Universities in 1962, and that year a cooperative organization of colleges and universities in the Kansas City area (the Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education) was also formed. Stephens College, long interested in new teaching media, in 1963 obtained support from the Fund for the Advancement of Education to develop a telephone hook-up for transmitting lectures to a network of small liberal arts colleges.

Renewed interest in the predominantly Negro colleges came in 1962 when the Class "A" accreditation of these institutions was discarded, and all were required to seek regular regional accreditation. Meetings held in Atlanta under Danforth Foundation sponsorship produced pleas for cooperative higher education efforts to support the education of Negroes in Prince Edward County where public schools had been abolished by local authorities seeking to avoid integration. As an outcome of these meetings and in the spirit of the civil rights movement, the cooperative movement was extended to the predominantly Negro colleges. In mid-1963 President Kennedy called a White House conference of educators and foundation personnel to seek their help in providing answers to the deepening racial crisis in America. The March on Washington was at hand and President Kennedy's advisers, particularly Jerrold Zacharias and Hobart Taylor, Jr., were urging expanded cooperation between northern universities and predominantly Negro colleges in the South. By 1964 several such arrangements were underway.

Cooperative patterns among church-related institutions, both Catholic and Protestant, have also increased, stimulated by the pressures of increased costs and the liberalizing effect of the ecumenical movement. Interinstitutional cooperation among Roman Catholic colleges had taken place on a small scale in bilateral relationships for some time, but in 1952, as a result of a National Catholic Education Association meeting, the Sister Formation Conference was created and cooperation followed at a greatly accelerated pace. A study just published by the National

Catholic Education Association shows that about one-third of the nation's 314 Catholic colleges are now involved in cooperative programs. Some two-thirds of these programs did not exist in 1960,[14] and many links have been forged with non-Catholic institutions.

Cooperation among Protestant colleges has shown a similar growth. Many of the 800 church-related colleges have been experimenting with a variety of combinations. Some have ties with non-religious associations, others are in new groupings as a result of initiatives taken by their own church boards. The Northwest Iowa College Association, a newly formed group, cuts across denominations in creating relationships between five institutions in that state. J. Lynn Leavenworth, director of the American Baptist Board of Education, said recently: "Ironically, it is likely to be practical consideration rather than devotion to ecumenism that dictates the future of our theological seminaries . . . now it is consolidate or else! Within ten years even some of the most determined and proud of our seminaries will be driven to seek cooperative relationships in order to survive . . . ."[15] During the past year the National Council of Churches through its Commission on Higher Education has spearheaded cooperative efforts between geographically proximal member colleges.

The most recent stimulus for cooperation has come from the Higher Education Act of 1965. Eighty-four cooperative programs between "developing" and "established" institutions in higher education were funded to begin operation in September 1966.

In retrospect the idea of achieving strength and quality through cooperation has been promoted in almost every segment of higher education and with an ever mounting fervor.

The Semantics of Cooperation

Interinstitutional cooperation goes under many names, the most common being center, consortium or council, cooperative and exchange program, and association. This nomenclature roughly covers a continuum: at one end are those groups which are tightly knit with an administrative emphasis, and at the other are those with looser, more occasional ties in which faculty members and students are the prominent participants.

In a center the administrators of member institutions work in a common agency that coordinates activities and initiates new programs.[16] "A cooperative dynamic is developed," as Herbert F. K. Fitzroy has put it, "in which one cooperative program suggests another, until the administrators and faculty members of the affiliated institutions find themselves to a surprising degree thinking cooperatively."[17] These centers often have directors whose role approaches that of a president of a university system. Perhaps the outstanding example of this kind of extensive interaction is the Claremont Colleges. Also illustrative are the University Center of Virginia, the Atlanta University Center, and the Piedmont University Center.

Consortia or councils tend to be federative arrangements for planning and coordination in specific areas. The linking agency is usually overshadowed by institutional members. The Joint Graduate Consortium in Washington, D.C., the Michigan Council of State College Presidents, and the Council of Higher Educational Institutions in New York City exemplify this pattern.

Cooperative and exchange programs appear as incidental ties, usually between institutions, for limited purposes--faculty or student exchange, joint use of facilities, or cooperative research. Examples of established bilateral relationships are Hampton Institute and Cornell University, Ursuline College and Bellarmine College, and the University of Wisconsin and North Carolina College.[18]

The term association usually refers to a group of loosely connected institutions organized on a regional or national basis. Official contact is often primarily at the level of the chief executive officer for project-by-project coordination. It is in the projects which bring individual students and faculty members together, and not in the interaction of institutions, that the reality of the associative structure exists. Problems sometimes arise in such associations because of inadequate machinery for decision making, limited independent resources, and underdeveloped communication arrangements. The Associated Colleges of the Midwest, Great Lakes College Association, and the Central States Colleges Association are typical associations.[19]

Other terms are also used--committee, program, group, interuniversity, institute, union--but these labels, even more than those above, are a search for the novel title and are not descriptive of the cooperative relationship. Combinations can also be seen as bilateral and multilateral, geographically proximal and distal, voluntary and compulsory, single purpose and multifunctional. The mainstream of higher education today is a network of cooperative relationships, and the larger the institution the more elaborate the fabric of cooperation. The University of Wisconsin, for example, reports 40 cooperative arrangements.[20]

The basic unit in cooperative programs is the college. Here, too, there is confusion: the term college applies to a wide range of institutions which share only limited characteristics. Accrediting agencies set a lower-end-range definition for "college." While this test is widely used, critics such as William K. Selden point to the difficulties inherent in allowing the established colleges to determine who will be allowed on the lower rungs of the higher education ladder. Not only are there no uniform standards, but accreditation criteria are often irrelevant and outdated.[21]

The Developing Colleges Program under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 has accepted accreditation as a criterion, but it has also extended eligibility to institutions submitting letters from accrediting agencies stating they are making "reasonable progress" toward achieving accreditation. Difficulties have nonetheless arisen because the problem-solving objectives of the Higher Education Act differ from the academic criteria applied in the accreditation procedures.

Other institutions, with far above minimal credentials, are excluded from the college category because their educational activities are seen mainly as byproducts of business or manufacturing. Programs at Raytheon, Xerox, and Polaroid Corporations are examples. Also traditionally glossed over are the cooperative educational programs between colleges and business, though they differ little from such usually cited programs as the Argonne Laboratories, the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies, or colleges cooperation under the TVA or NASA.[22] Appropriate definitions of a college need to turn less on statements of institutional mission and more on the educational results for students and society. In the future, business, industrial, and governmental units will carry on expanded educational programs which may well affect society to a greater extent than does "college."

The use of the word cooperation also presents significant omissions and contradictions. In the professional journals interinstitutional cooperation usually means voluntary relationships, as distinct from legally mandated arrangements. But the potential importance of these latter relationships is great. State legislatures have authorized coordinating councils and boards, most often with advisory powers, in 41 states.[23] While such combinations are excluded from this discussion, the rapid spread of this device underlines the importance of some form of compulsion in interinstitutional coordination. Indeed, most so-called voluntary arrangements, though without legal mandate, do operate within the rather considerable bounds set by foundations and government grants.

Commentators on cooperative arrangements usually omit multicampus relationships between major state universities and their subordinate units, such as exist in the Missouri, Wisconsin, and North Carolina systems. Similarly omitted (though extensively reported in the literature) are the large number of established links between two-year institutions and four-year colleges, and between baccalaureate programs and graduate and professional schools (the common 3-2 arrangement). These are, however, bona fide instances of interinstitutional cooperation and may be, in fact, precisely the kind of articulation with the greatest promise for a better allocation of our limited educational resources.

The exclusion of so many relationships from discussions of institutional cooperation only further emphasizes how widespread the pattern of combinations has become. In sum, the literature reflects a groping. We do not yet know how to label programs mainly because so little is known about what is taking place.

Mounting Pressures for Cooperation

Internal and external pressures interacting with the promise of new opportunities have promoted a great variety of cooperative patterns. Concern about multiplying enrollments, rising costs, the explosion of knowledge, and ways to use the new media--in recent writings by Logan Wilson, Francis Keppel, Seymour Harris, Frederick Bolman, and James Doi--almost invariably point to interinstitutional cooperation as a major ameliorative device.[24]

The quest for quality, particularly for "developing" colleges, also promotes cooperation. Whether criteria for quality are the student-related ones of Winslow Hatch, a yardstick for institutions as described by Samuel Baskin, dimensions of democratization as projected by John Brubacher, or a variable of size as seen by Richard O. Poorman, it is agreed that colleges cannot promote quality in isolation from one another.[25]

Pressure to expand graduate education facilities has presented a continuing reason for cooperation. The Southern Regional Education Board began with this primary motivation, and the newer state coordinating boards invariably give high priority to college cooperation in graduate instruction, often because of the heavy costs involved. The New England Board of Higher Education now plans to coordinate Ph.D. programs among its six state universities; similar tendencies are apparent in the University of Michigan's special cooperative program with small colleges near Ann Arbor.[26] [illegible] University of Minnesota has recently announced a program with neighboring liberal arts colleges which will aid these small institutions in holding their faculties by permitting their professors to do some teaching and research in graduate departments at the state's major university. Temple University's program with five liberal arts colleges in southeast Pennsylvania, and the Duke University-University of North Carolina Marine Biology Laboratory are other examples.[27]

Perhaps the most noteworthy instances of cooperation in which universities are taking the lead are the newly created industrial research parks in Lafayette, Ind.; Cambridge, Mass.; and Durham, N.C.[28] It is the research and consulting opportunities that these parks afford which bring higher education and business to the service of each other.

Scarce instructional resources for non-Western programs,

3

particularly in connection with language studies, further illustrate the pressures to combine.[29] Examples are programs at Antioch and Earlham, Western College for Women and Miami University, the Gettysburg Group, the St. Paul Group, Wake Forest College and Winston-Salem State College, the Capital District Group in Albany, N.Y., and members of the Associated Colleges of the Midwest. The Russian language program in Worcester, Mass., the Italian language and literature group centered in Chicago, and the critical languages program at Princeton are other notable examples.

Similarly, the practice of using facilities jointly is expanding. The sharing of library resources, perhaps the oldest kind of combination, is done frequently.[30] The Computer Center in the Research Triangle Area in North Carolina links North Carolina State University at Raleigh, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and Duke University at Durham; the University of Texas, Huston-Tillotson College, and St. Edwards University are connected by microwave in the Texas Educational Microwave Project; and similar networks exist in the Midwest Program on Airborne Television Instruction and the West Central Florida College TV network. Harvard and Yale have come together with nearly a dozen other institutions as part of the Lowell Institute Cooperating Broadcasting Radio and Television network.

Encouragement for interinstitutional cooperation has also come from many points outside of the campus. Programs conducted by several agencies of the Federal Government push colleges together. The National Science Foundation has assisted such cooperative undertakings as the oceanographic program at Duke University, the Joint Computer program in North Carolina, and the Marine Science Research Center at Santa Catalina Island. The Tennessee Valley Authority was partial sponsor of the Council on Cooperative College Projects which services a wide range of institutions including predominantly Negro colleges in Kentucky, Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and Texas. Numerous projects have involved the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Institutes of Health, and the National Science Foundation. The necessities of diplomacy and defense forge links, many of which--as *Ramparts* magazine has recently uncovered--are tangentially education at best, and most such programs are classified.[31]

Under Title II of the National Defense Education Act, the U.S. Office of Education established an Education Communications System to study the possibilities of electronic interconnection between colleges and universities. The USOE has also contracted to finance the Harvard Center for Educational Research, which involves 12 agencies and school systems. Under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the USOE invested $5 million in cooperative programs in 1965-66 and an expected

$30 million in 1966-67. The Elementary and Secondary Act encourages cooperation under its provisions for supplementary educational centers, research and development, and regional educational laboratories. This legislation indicates an increasingly important role for government agencies in sponsoring cooperative relationships.

Even more significant forces may be promoting interinstitutional cooperation at the state level. Prominent are the programs under interstate compact regional boards. Through serving as exchange points for information and as data-collecting agencies, these boards promote cooperation among colleges almost as their primary function. Kroepsch and Kaplan, in Logan Wilson's Emerging Patterns, have given a detailed analysis of the function of regional boards.[32] Under NEBHE, for example, the six state university libraries in New England will develop centralized processing and cataloging.[33] NEBHE also reports support from the New England Governors' Council to permit community colleges along the border of one state to be used by students from beyond that state line without the payment of out-of-state tuition and with both states contributing to the development of the facility.

States encourage cooperation because of their growing financial commitment to higher education. One practical impetus has been the need to reduce budgetary competition among systems of higher education--teacher-training institutions, land-grant schools, urban universities, community colleges, and technical institutes--emerging within the same state. In the absence of systematic cooperation, state legislatures in effect are forced to become supra-boards of trustees. The necessity to formulate "state plans" responsive to all segments of higher education under the Higher Education Facilities Act has also prompted cooperation at the state level. Perhaps the most dramatic state-based activity is the Compact for Education, which by midsummer of 1966 had 33 states and 3 territories in its membership.[34]

Cooperation at the state level will certainly expand. The New York State Education Department is now actively encouraging interinstitutional cooperation. Indiana has evolved an effective working relationship in financial matters between public and private institutions in the state. The administration of the Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1963 requires a statewide school-college planning board. Just how far partnership between the state and its private, particularly parochial, institutions may go will depend on the outcome of appeals made from the decision of the Maryland Supreme Court, which in 1966 ruled that certain state contributions to sectarian higher institutions were unconstitutional.[35]

Since 1960 the cooperative movement has surged ahead, in large part because of the associations themselves which continually expand memberships and extend their range of activities. The idea that it is desirable to have an association seems to have become in itself a motivating factor as many new groups have emerged. Several associations have been identified with an arbitrary geographical base (for example, Missouri Valley Colleges Association, Associated Rocky Mountain Universities, and Central States College Association), while more geographically circumscribed are the Harrisburg Area Center for Higher Education and the Higher Education Coordinating Council for St. Louis. So extensive is this urge to combine that there is now a move to establish an Association of Associations.

Possibilities for expanded research have often prompted cooperation. Much of the activity under CIC is in cooperative research; the New York City Center for Research and Development is a similar relationship, with a public education focus. Subjects also have stimulated cooperation: work in astronomy prompts college cooperation in Arizona; political research brings many universities to Ann Arbor; gerontology links the University of Michigan and Wayne State University. A new group, University Research Associates Inc., has been formed to bid on a proposed 200 BEV accelerator to be established under the Atomic Energy Commission.

Finally the private philanthropic and business-related foundations have been a major stimulating force. It is not always clear whether foundations provide the initiative or whether colleges propose an effort and then search out financial support; what is clear, however, is that behind most cooperative ventures a foundation is usually to be found. The Hill Foundation played a major role in the grouping of colleges in the Twin City area of Minnesota; the Kettering Foundation and Western Electric have been particularly active in the field of engineering; the Danforth Foundation works among the predominantly Negro colleges; the Kellogg Foundation in activities in the communication media and continuing education; the Russell Sage Foundation in groupings for Far Eastern studies; and the Rockefeller Foundation in aiding "disadvantaged students" and expanding teaching resources. The Carnegie Corporation and the Ford Foundation are involved in a great variety of cooperative relationships at all stages of development. This is, of course, a most incomplete list.

As these facts indicate, interinstitutional cooperation extends beyond such well-known regional groupings as the Southern Regional Education Board, the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, or the New England Board of Higher Education, and it far exceeds the highly publicized programs linking larger northern universities with predominantly Negro colleges in the South. More than a hundred associations and a thousand cooperative relationships are reported in the literature. Raymond Moore of the U.S. Office of Education has identified 900 relationships involving graduate instruction alone.[36]

Pressures for cooperation have come steadily but in an uncoordinated fashion: government at all levels is involved, many private foundations have a major interest, and the colleges themselves are encouraging such efforts. The result is a maze of organizations with confusing labels. In short, there is a wealth of information which cries out for analysis.

II. ANALYSIS

The Problem of Understanding What Is Happening

Simply understanding the growth and operation of large institutions, let alone influencing their development, is difficult. Beyond the systematic assembling of data there must be ways to gain insights. To date, processes of interinstitutional relations have remained largely immune from scholarship. The absence of theory is central to the problem. Without a set of facts to relate to each other no principles emerge, comparative studies cannot be mounted, and no systematic knowledge is assembled.

The truly interesting questions remain beyond our grasp. What are the distortions of perception that are encouraging the combination movement? Are students and faculty members being affected in a productive way? What are the issues posed by the new arrangements? What are the elements common to successful cooperation? Can we expect a clash of elites in this institutional transformation? Will needed educational innovations come? Could a reallocation of resources result?

Effective analysis will require purposeful taxonomy. Little more than a beginning are the categorizations of Ertell, Anderson, Donovan, Koenker, and Martorana which organize programs by: (1) the number of participating units (bilateral, multilateral, constellational); (2) the distance separating institutions (metropolitan, statewide, regional, interregional, or national); (3) participating clientele (church-related, small colleges, Roman Catholic institutions, or predominantly Negro colleges); (4) the nature of the activity (instructional, research, administrative, or service); (5) the level of instruction (precollege, undergraduate, graduate, or continuing education); or (6) the legal basis of the agreement.[37] Still to be distinguished are developmental programs from incidental projects, the short-run endeavor from programs of interdependence, student or faculty initiated efforts from those that are administratively mandated. As Herbert W. K. Fitzroy has put it, we need to sort out the "interinstitutional cooperatives [which] involve practices and relationships which go directly to the heart of the educational responsibilities of the college."[38]

A lack of comparative studies prevents even the rough measurement of the relative effectiveness of college-to-college cooperation in raising quality or in meeting various pressures. For cooperative programs involving developing colleges, little analysis exists as to how the combination responds to institutional needs and priorities for both partners in the exchange relationship. We should know, for example, how interstitutional cooperation as an amelioratory device compares with projects sponsored by major associations within disciplines, by accrediting agencies, or by management consultant firms.[39]

A theoretical framework would throw light on the quid pro quo elements implicit in cooperation. Rejection of the "big brother" attitude in bilateral relationships has been described and detailed by Beatrice R. Buszek.[40] Not so well documented is the reverse, an exploration of what a developing college can bring to an established college--yet the developing college's program may depend on this knowledge.

Interinstitutional cooperation should be seen as a process. The origins of programs have not yet been told, especially the role played in the cooperative movement as a whole by the major foundations, the President's Science Advisory Board, the American Council on Education, Educational Services Inc., and the U.S. Office of Education--to mention only a few of the prominent initiators.[41] When documented, the factors which prompted major universities in the Midwest to take the initiative in this effort may well go beyond their announced objectives of promoting efficiency and economy. The differential role of students, faculty members, and administrators in sustaining projects once they are started also needs to be set forth. We know too little of what has prompted development, revision, and discontinuation of programs. Rather than providing answers, for example, the announcement that a foundation grant has not been extended merely raises questions.

With almost no model building, simulation theory, or cyclical analysis it is not surprising that many basic questions remain unanswered. How does the goal of upgrading quality relate to the objectives of more community service and extended aid to less developed colleges? How does the movement for cooperation square with traditional regard for institutional autonomy? How does government-sponsored cooperation confirm or deny traditional fears of government control? What will be the educational consequences of increased college interdependence with business and industry?

To answer such questions a more adequate theoretical foundation will be required. Scholars will have to take into account external pressures along with internal factors. The ecology of cooperation has--at least--demographic, economic, and ideological dimensions. A range of specific pressures from legislatures, governing boards, elected officials, opinion molders, and historic precedent--as well as the traditional educational concerns--will have to be assessed. Thus far the literature on interinstitutional cooperation, like the literature on higher education in general, has only pointed to the important matters that need to be explored.

Alternatives and Innovations: The Search for Clarity

The preceding sections contain some suggested areas in which research and development are needed in order to accumulate a systematic body of theory, to deepen our understanding of the dynamics of interinstitutional cooperation, and to see it within its historical context. The beginnings of such concerns have arisen from the movement to dispense with the pragmatic and idyllic concepts based on 18th-century thought. Recognizing the aspects of contemporary higher education involving the balance of power and executively oriented big business, educators have begun to make use of Galbraithean theory, infrastructure models, and systems analysis technique.[42]

Commentators on higher education have pointed to areas where research can proceed. Eldon Johnson suggests that we probe the origins of existing cooperative programs and project the limits of the cooperative device.[43] M. M. Chambers urges study of the increasing conflict between the heretofore private world of higher education and state coordinating boards which thrust colleges and universities deep into state politics.[44] Owen A. Knorr asks why, in the face of so much discussion, so few students and professors are directly affected; he suggests that an adequate explanation will point up the staunch individualism of chief executive officers. Such probing may also document major restraints on cooperation exercised by university faculties in the individual disciplines.

According to John J. Hicks, the accumulation of knowledge on how cooperative programs actually work will convince the higher education community that interinstitutional cooperation is worth the additional investment.[45] Irwin K. French of the New York State Education Department has suggested that new programs might be tried in such nonacademic areas as food services and buildings and grounds. Fred E. Crossland asks for more use of the cooperative device in recruiting college students, citing the British experience as a model.[46] Winslow Hatch has urged that cooperation be stimulated through the academic disciplines, in the hope that such relationships would be more functional and have promise of a longer duration.

Program evaluators suggest the accumulation of information on the administration of existing cooperatives. John Blue of the U.S. Office of Education has pointed out the need to assess the real costs, including illusive overhead; Stanley F. Salwak has projected a "determinance of usefulness" for measuring programs; and Eldon Johnson has offered a guide that might be used for determining how much cooperation has taken place.[47] The Princeton Conference in 1962 and the Morehouse Conference in 1965 both detailed large and small matters to be asked about cooperation: e.g., the permanence of academic gains, long-distance versus short-distance exchanges, and a range of pressures (of size, of institutional economy, of growing material rather than human concerns, of weakened decision making and undermined management skills).[48]

As a counterbalance to the present emphasis in the literature on the chief executive officer's point of view, more clarity may come through descriptive monographs assessing the experience of participants in cooperative arrangements. Such empirical studies should include recorded experience which goes beyond data obtained from mailed questionnaires. Such studies would also reduce the emphasis on goals of economy and would provide new thinking on how the cooperative device improves quality in the higher educational enterprise. The literature about current cooperative programs could be made more valuable if directors of existing associations would detail the pressures and constraints under which they operate and would outline the special opportunities that the combination device presents for overcoming resistance to change in higher education.

Especially important would be new studies that focus upon special problems, such as the utility of the cooperative device in the small liberal arts college's struggle to survive.

Other educators have suggested that support be given to exploring the extension of the cooperative device into underdeveloped areas of higher education. James Crow of the University of Wisconsin, following an exchange experience at Morehouse College, urged broader use of cooperative arrangements as a way to improve communication with prospective graduate students from institutions not presently well represented in graduate education. Philip G. Hubbard, academic affairs dean at the University of Iowa, saw the exchange programs as one way of permitting a developing institution to gain some distinction through specialization. The National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges has urged colleges to come together to promote off-campus instruction for those who desire higher education but who are unable to come to the campus. The Carnegie Corporation has advanced the idea that interinstitutional cooperation might help in producing more leaders, and the CIC has said its cooperative arrangement should be used for cooperative curriculum studies at the university level. Optimal institutional size and the hazards presented by overzealous, combination-minded state universities are questioned by Raymond G. Gibson.[49] And Martin Lichterman has expressed concern about the expansive inroads by business into higher education, often under the label of cooperation.

In these areas and others authors have seen a major role for the

USOE and for private foundations in providing seed grants, initiating pilot projects, and underwriting the needed research. Clearly projects of this sort would add to our knowledge of the interinstitutional movement.

The Frontier: New Roles for Old Institutions

We can clarify the functions of interinstitutional cooperation and produce insights into it. But will we go beyond informational objectives? Should not the interinstitutional device, once it is known, lead to restructuring for higher education and redirection toward greater public responsibility? New organizational devices allow for possibilities heretofore frustrated by the traditionally organized university. The main frontier, implicit in the whole cooperative movement, is in the invention of new roles for old institutions.

It is in the acceptance of increased social responsibilities that these new roles emerge. Colleges must do more than cooperate if they are to do better what they have traditionally done fairly well--produce technicians and provide research for the highest bidder. Twentieth-century America is scarred by continuing wars, decaying cities, pockets of poverty, technological tyrannies, community disillusionment, and a threatening nuclear holocaust. Higher education must face these issues; it can no longer pursue traditional goals, for it too struggles in the same web. Its resources must be marshalled to effect an escape.

Funding procedures must also change. In the past the professor went to government, business, foundations, or to the military in search of funds. Money was parceled out year by year for projects meeting the objectives of funding groups. Projects proliferated, teaching talent was siphoned off, and research accumulated that was unused. Deep pastoral roots in higher education nurtured aloofness from the social struggle. Isolated, colleges failed to change adequately even themselves, their curriculum or teaching methods, the composition of faculties and students, the manner of their extension or service mission. When the institution is uninvolved, much that it does is irrelevant. Students articulate this alienation: a university uncommitted to forging ethical social goals in itself, its community, and in the world has in fact already become aligned with reaction.

The cooperative device is needed to reach beyond the individual professor and project, or even the individual institution, to focus larger aggregates of higher education on a higher order of commitment. Cooperation can mean the alignment of higher education away from enchantments with economies of various sorts and toward leadership in promoting change. Whole institutions can link themselves for leverage to encourage community development, to overcome racial antipathies, or to promote a supranational loyalty.

Committing combinations of colleges to probe perplexing social problems would test the limits of the interinstitutional device and give it life. How far can cooperation go to reduce the gap between advanced and developing colleges? Can such associating push beyond desegregation in higher education and toward true integration? Will college consortia mean commitment to cities? Can university centers produce a passion for universals to redress the narrowness of nationalisms?

The agenda of problems is long but it essentially involves commitment to basic reforms. Higher education could make a difference. Foundations and government should give support priorities to that interinstitutional cooperation which seeks to transform the community of scholars into scholars at work building community at home and abroad. No greater rejuvenation could be given to higher education than direction toward tasks that must be done.

FOOTNOTES

1. Christian E. Burckel, ed., The College Blue Book. 9th, 10th, 11th editions. New York, C. E. Burckel, 1959, 1962, 1965. Clarence E. Lovejoy, Lovejoy's College Guide. New York, Simon and Schuster, 1966. Allan M. Cartter, ed., American Universities and Colleges. 8th, 9th editions. Washington, American Council on Education, 1960, 1964. James Cass and Max Birnbaum, Comparative Guide to American Colleges for Students, Parents, and Counselors. New York, Harper & Row, 1964.

2. Digest of Educational Statistics. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1963, 1965. W. E. Armstrong, "Regional and Professional Accreditation." Liberal Education, vol. 48, No. 2, p. 234-42. May, 1962. Earned Degrees Conferred. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1961-66. Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, Pt. 1, "Institutional Data." Washington, Government Printing Office, 1959-64. Statistics of Non-public Secondary Schools. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1963. Statistics of State School Systems. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1961.

3. Arthur J. Dibden, "A Department of Higher Education: Problems and Prospects." Educational Record, vol. 46, p. 209-16. Summer, 1965.

4. David Riesman, "Alteration in Institutional Attitude and Behavior." In Logan Wilson, ed., Emerging Patterns in Higher Education, p. 66-74. Washington, American Council on Education, 1965. Robert J. Havighurst, American Higher Education in the 1960's. Columbus, Ohio State University Press, 1960. Clyde E. Blocker, Robert H. Plummer, and Richard C. Richardson, Jr., The Two Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1965.

5. Talcott Parsons, "School Class as a Social System: Some of Its Functions in American Society." Harvard Educational Review, vol. 29,

No. 4, p. 297-318. Fall 1959. André Danière, Higher Education in the American Economy. New York, Random House, 1964. See also Burton D. Friedman, Higher Education in the United States Perceived as a Social System. Dissertation. Michigan State University, 1961. Nevitt Sanford, ed., The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of Higher Learning. New York, John Wiley, 1962.

6. The author is indebted for this thought to Frampton Davis, a student of James Doi at the University of Michigan.

7. Eldon L. Johnson, "College Federations." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 35, No. 1, p. 1. January, 1966. Until recently Johnson was president of the Great Lakes College Association.

8. Lerone Bennett, Jr., "The African Past." Ebony, vol. 16, p. 34-40. July, 1961.

9. Malcolm Carron, The Contract Colleges at Cornell University. Ithaca, N.Y., Cornell University Press, 1958.

10. Merle Curti and Richard Nash, Philanthropy in the Shaping of American Education, p. 177-78. New Brunswick, N.J., Rutgers University Press, 1965. David Boroff, Campus U.S.A. New York, Harper and Bros., 1961. Merton W. Ertell, Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education, p. 5, 53. Albany, N.Y., University of the State of New York, 1957. Also pamphlets from the Atlanta University Center.

11. Algo D. Henderson, "The CCC of College Relations." Educational Record, vol. 43, No. 1, p. 48-56. April, 1962.

12. Alfred T. Hill, "Cooperation Among Small Colleges." In George F. Donovan, ed., College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation, p. 34-46. Washington, Catholic University of America Press, 1965.

13. Stanley F. Salwak, "The Need for Cooperation and the CIC Response." Educational Record, vol. 45, No. 3, p. 308-16. Summer 1964.

14. Sister M. Dolores Salerno, "Patterns of Interinstitutional Cooperation in American Catholic Higher Education." National Catholic Educational Association Bulletin, vol. 62, No. 4, p. 4. May, 1966.

15. J. L. Leavenworth, "Towards Seminary Merger: Possible Forms of Cooperation." Christian Century, vol. 43, p. 527. April 27, 1966.

16. John J. Wittich, "The College Center Movement." College and University Journal, vol. 1, p. 31-34. Summer 1962.

17. Herbert W. K. Fitzroy, Interinstitutional Cooperation: Hopes and Reality, p. 12. Richmond, University Center in Virginia, 1962. Address delivered to the Conference on College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation, Princeton, N.J., April 13, 1962.

18. For an example of a cooperative and exchange program, see Hampton Institute, "Possible Cooperative Relationships Between Hampton Institute and Major Universities." 18th Annual Educational Staff Institute, September 14-15, 1964.

19. Eldon Johnson has suggested that the Great Lakes College Association aims to move in the direction of the Claremont College pattern.

20. All of the top-ranking institutions in Allan Cartter's recent study of graduate education have multiple cooperative arrangements. These include University of California at Berkeley, Harvard, Illinois, Wisconsin, Princeton, Michigan, Chicago, M.I.T., California Institute of Technology, Stanford, and Yale.

21. William K. Selden, "The Relative Unimportance of Regional Accreditation." Journal of Teacher Education, vol. 13, p. 319-25. September, 1966.

22. Earl H. Pierro, ed., Change and Opportunity in the Tennessee Valley States. Fort Valley, Ga., Council on Cooperative College Projects, 1964. Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies, Inc., 19th Annual Report. N.p., June 30, 1965.

23. M. M. Chambers, Chance and Choice in Higher Education. Bloomington, Ind., Bloomcraft Press, 1962. Chambers, Freedom and Repression in Higher Education. Bloomington, Ind., Bloomcraft Press, 1965. Also letters and data from the state coordinating agencies in Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, Ohio, Texas, Utah, and Virginia.

24. Wilson, ed., op. cit. Francis Keppel, The Necessary Revolution in American Education. New York, Harper & Row, 1966. Seymour Harris and Alan Levensohn, eds., Education and Public Policy. Berkeley, McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1965. Seymour Harris, Kenneth M. Deitch, and Alan Levensohn, eds., Challenge and Change in American

Education. Berkeley, McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1965. Frederick Bolman, "Needed Research in Administration of Higher Education." *Educational Record*, vol. 46, No. 2, p. 166-76. Spring 1965. James Doi, "Pressures to Increase Educational Productivity in Institutions." In *Current Issues in Higher Education*, p. 112-14. Washington, Association on Higher Education, 1965. See also Robert C. Anderson, Stanley J. Wenberg, and Wendel P. Jones, "What Are the Current Potential Implications of Regional Cooperation Among Institutions of Higher Education for Improving and Extending Educational Opportunities?" In *Current Issues in Higher Education*, p. 142-52. Washington, Association for Higher Education, 1958; Ruth E. Eckert, "Patterns of Interinstitutional Cooperation." In *Current Issues in Higher Education*, p. 96-102. Washington, Association for Higher Education, 1953; T. C. Holy, "What Contributions Can Voluntary State and Regional Cooperative Planning Make Toward Meeting Increased Enrollments?" In *Current Issues in Higher Education*, p. 244-50. Washington, Association for Higher Education, 1955; and James C. Messersmith, "Ideas and Patterns for Future Programs of Interinstitutional Cooperation." In *Current Issues in Higher Education*, p. 150-53. Washington, Association for Higher Education, 1962.

25. Winslow R. Hatch, *What Standards Do We Raise?* Washington, Government Printing Office, 1960. (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *New Dimensions in Higher Education*, No. 12.). Samuel Baskin, *Quest for Quality*. *Ibid*., No. 7; John S. Brubacher, *Bases for Policy in Higher Education*. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1965. Richard O. Poorman, "The Small College: A Second Look." *Catholic Educational Review*, vol. 63, No. 3, p. 145-56. March, 1965.

26. "Among the Colleges." *Liberal Education*, vol. 48, No. 6, p. 552. December, 1962.

27. Millard E. Gladfelter, *Higher Education in the United States*, p. 91-92. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1960. See also "Duke University Marine Laboratory 1965," a booklet prepared for the dedication of the biological research vessel *Eastward*.

28. "The Emphasis Is on Practicality." *Industrial Development*, p. 39-51. August, 1963.

29. Don Peretz, "Cooperative Faculty Seminar in Far Eastern Art and Culture." *Liberal Education*, vol. 51, No. 1, p. 497-503. December, 1965. Ward Morehouse, *The International Dimensions of Education in New York State*. Albany, N.Y., State Education Department, 1963.

Morehouse, "Strengthening the Study of Neglected Cultures." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 34, No. 6, p. 311-17. June 1963. The Challenge of a Revolutionary World: Progress Reports. Albany, N.Y., State Education Department, 1963, 1964, 1965. Association of American Colleges, Non-Western Studies in the Liberal Arts College. Washington, 1964.

30. Maurice F. Tauber, "Trends and Tangents--The Library." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 34, p. 170-71. March, 1963.

31. Adolfo Gilly, "The University on the Make." Ramparts, vol. 4, No. 12, p. 11-22. April, 1966.

32. Robert H. Kroepsch and M. Stephen Kaplan, "Interstate Cooperation and Coordination in Higher Education." In Wilson, ed., op. cit., p. 174-90.

33. This project is funded by the Council on Library Resources.

34. J. B. Conant, "How the Compact Can Assist the Universities." Educational Record, vol. 47, p. 99-105. Winter 1966.

35. The Horace Mann League of the United States v. The Board of Public Works of Maryland. 220 A 2nd 51 (1966).

36. This is a study of graduate consortia being conducted by the U.S. Office of Education. It is based upon a mailed questionnaire to a wide range of institutions of higher education. Findings were to be published in the fall of 1966.

37. Ertell, op. cit., see n. 10 above. Wayne W. Anderson, Cooperation Within American Higher Education. Washington, Association of American Colleges, 1964. George F. Donovan, "The Philosophy of Interinstitutional Cooperation in American Higher Education," p. 3-18. College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation, op. cit. Robert H. Koenker, Institutional Cooperation at the Graduate Level. Muncie, Ind., Ball State College, 1962.

38. Fitzroy, op. cit.

39. Some of the more prominent consulting firms are the Academy for Educational Development, Nelson Associates, A. T. Kearney and Company, and the Institute for Educational Planning, Inc.

40. Beatrice Ross Buszek, "Cornell University and Hampton Institute. Expanding Opportunities, vol. 2, No. 1, p. 6-11. January, 1965. "A Working Conference on Cooperative Programs Among Universities and Predominantly Negro Colleges." Typescript. Atlanta, Morehead College, August 20, 1965.

41. See, for example, Samuel Nabrit, Steven White, and Jerrold Zacharias, "Proposal for the Development of Predominantly Negro Colleges." Unpublished manuscript presented to the American Council on Education, October, 1962.

42. Alexander W. Astin, "Empirical Characterization of Higher Educational Institutions." Journal of Education Psychology, vol. 53, p. 224-35. October, 1962. U.S. Office of Education, Residence and Migration and the College Student. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1963. Gordon M. Ambach, "Regional Commission versus State Commission for Administration of Title I, Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963." Unpublished paper, Harvard University, 1965. Merton W. Ertell, "Toward a Philosophy of Interinstitutional Cooperation." Educational Record, vol. 39, No. 2, p. 131-39. April, 1958. Wilson, ed., see n. 4 above. Ralph J. Murray, "The Theory and Practice of Cooperation." College and University Journal, vol. 2, p. 31-34. Summer, 1963. Donovan, see n. 37 above; Eckert, see n. 24 above.

43. Eldon L. Johnson, "Cooperation in Higher Education." Liberal Education, vol. 48, No. 6, p. 475-78. December, 1962.

44. Chambers, Freedom and Repression in Higher Education, see n. 23 above.

45. John J. Hicks, "Promoting Institutional Cooperation by Small Dribbles of Money," In John J. Wittich, ed., College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation, p. 46, 49, and passim. Corning, N.Y., College Center of the Finger Lakes, 1962. Proceedings of a Conference on College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation, Princeton, N.J., 1962.

46. Fred E. Crossland, "Politics and Policies, the College Admissions." Phi Delta Kappan, vol. 46, No. 7, p. 299-302. March, 1965.

47. See "Working Conference," n. 40 above. See also Salwak, n. 13 above. Johnson, see n. 43 above.

48. Wittich, ed., see n. 45 above. See also "Working Conference," n. 40 above.

49. Raymond C. Gibson, The Challenge of Leadership in Higher Education, p. 7. Dubuque, Iowa, William C. Brown Co., 1964.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Pressures on Higher Education

1. Andrews, F. Emerson, ed., *Foundations, 20 Viewpoints*. New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1965. 108 p.

Since interinstitutional cooperation receives a great deal of support from foundations, this collection of essays provides helpful guides to higher educational administrators for their relations with foundation officers. Among the titles are "How Foundations Evaluate Requests," by Yorke Allen, Jr., of the Rockefeller Foundation; "Preparing the Foundation Proposal," by Manning M. Pattillo of the Danforth Foundation; and "What the New Foundation Executive Should Know," by President James A. Perkins of Cornell University.

2. Blocker, Clyde E., Robert H. Plummer, and Richard C. Richardson, Jr., *The Two Year College: A Social Synthesis*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1965. 298 p.

An attempt to understand the evolution and problems of the two-year and community colleges. The authors position themselves outside of the atmosphere of protective fervor that accompanied the establishment of these colleges. They review present problems and needs of the colleges in the context of social pressures, and they define and contrast various positions on the educational continuum from reactionary to radical. Ways in which these various orientations combine with external pressures in shaping the two-year institution are discussed, and the authors take the position that the chief offerings of the junior college should be in technical-vocational and adult education.

3. *Blueprint for Action by Universities for Achieving Integration in Education*. Madison, Wis., Institute of Human Relations, University of Wisconsin, 1964.

A report of the third conference of Big Ten Universities and the University of Chicago on the Negro. This pamphlet outlines specific steps

a university must take if equal educational opportunity is to be realized. These include setting the university's own house in order, aggressive programs with secondary schools, and clear commitment to social justice in the university's own community. The special opportunities opened up through cooperative and exchange programs with predominantly Negro colleges are presented. Francis Keppel calls the Blueprint priority reading, a model for the kind of serious and positive approach that must be taken.

4. Brumbaugh, A. J., State-Wide Planning and Coordination of Higher Education. Atlanta, Southern Regional Education Board, 1963. 50 p.

The author reviews the functions and powers of state higher educational coordinating agencies, with particular reference to the southern region, and assembles a list of recommended requirements for effective state planning and coordination of higher education. He suggests that coordinating agencies become highly independent and exercise explicit powers.

5. Bunnel, Kevin P., and Eldon Johnson, "Interinstitutional Cooperation." Samuel Baskin, ed., Higher Education, Some Newer Developments. New York, McGraw Hill, 1965, p. 246-72.

The authors distinguish between function-centered and institution-centered cooperation, and infer that the latter is more strictly interinstitutional cooperation. Such cooperation develops, in part, to achieve economies of scale; more significantly, it is a "groping for completeness" while dealing with new challenges. Cited advantages of cooperation are a united front, savings, and the opportunity to experiment. Limitations include the threat to autonomy, inadequate communication, self-interest, uniformity, and an inappropriate organizational structure. Cooperation is discussed under interstate compact agencies, large corporate groupings, federated multilateral arrangements, and bilateral programs. The authors feel that cooperation seems to hold something for everyone; however, it has inherent limitations and its "current popularity probably outruns its merit." The real question raised is whether a college, when facing an important issue, will act with others or for itself.

6. Chambers, M. M., The Campus and the People. Danville, Ill., Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1960. 75 p.; Chance and Choice in Higher Education. Bloomington, Ind., The Bloomcraft Press, 1965. 119 p.; Freedom and Repression in Higher Education. Bloomington, Ind., The Bloomcraft Press, 1965. 126 p.

These books contain the author's case for greater interinstitutional cooperation but with insistence that it be voluntary and university centered. In the opinion of the author, higher education knows best its own needs and does not require special prodding to assume public responsibilities. Compulsory state or national coordination and planning are therefore not required even though higher education receives ever-increasing public support. If Indiana's voluntary program of cooperation, not Conant's Shaping of Educational Policy, is taken as the model, needed regional and national responsibilities will be more effectively undertaken, he believes.

7. Doi, James, "Pressures to Increase Educational Productivity in Institutions." Current Issues in Higher Education, p. 112-14. 1965.

The author discusses current quality measurements of colleges and universities and the "productivity trap" they present. An example is the likelihood that there will be more concern with the number of student credit hours of instruction than with the quality of each hour's instruction. Doi's thesis, "Colleges and universities do not, as of now, possess valid measures of 'educational productivity,'" leads him to conclude that there are only two choices left: either permit the confusion to continue or launch a concerted effort to obtain and employ viable educational measurements. Since interinstitutional cooperation is heralded as a device for upgrading quality, the resolution of this problem is urgent.

8. Fishman, Joshua A., "Higher Education in a Megapolis." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 33, No. 3, p. 72-76. January, 1962.

The specialization and cooperation among colleges within commuting distance of each other is advocated to overcome excesses in institutional autonomy and to permit larger enrollments while yet maintaining quality instruction. The author shows that cooperation is not exclusively a need of "have not" colleges, and finds the major obstacle to cooperation to be "intramural parochialism."

9. Gibson, Raymond C., The Challenge of Leadership in Higher Education. Dubuque, Iowa, W. C. Brown, 1964. 362 p.

The author notes that the trend toward combinations among independent institutions of higher education parallels the actions by some large state universities to inhibit the growth of smaller institutions within their system or state. He also notes the new challenge posed by urban universities and the tendency of some private institutions to come under public control.

10. Havighurst, Robert J., American Higher Education in the 1960's. Columbus, Ohio State University Press, 1960. 92 p.

This book contains a social scientist's predictions for higher education in the sixties in terms of trends in economics, demography, and ideology. Cause and effect relationships involving social mobility and per capita income are used to explain factors in expansion, admissions, and other policies adopted by both public and private institutions. As the ecology of higher education changes around the crucial year 1965, a shift in concern is predicted from economics to ideology in institutional goals.

11. Howes, Raymond F., ed., Higher Education and the Society It Serves. Washington, American Council on Education, 1956. 103 p.

A collection of 14 statements presented at the annual meeting of the American Council on Education, 1956, by educators and representatives of industry, labor, agriculture, and local, State, and Federal governments. The statements represent the beginnings of exploration in cooperation between institutions of higher learning, commerce, and government.

12. Knight, Douglas M., ed., The Federal Government in Higher Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1960. 205 p.

This is a final summary by six members of the Seventeenth American Assembly (1960). It explores, historically and speculatively, the role of the Federal Government in higher education. It illuminates the pressures on institutions, the purposes of the Federal Government, and the necessity for the coordination of the two to reflect a true national policy for education.

13. Mayhew, Lewis B., "The Literature of Higher Education, 1965." Educational Record, vol. 47, No. 1, p. 18-49. Winter, 1966.

An annotated bibliography of books on higher education published in 1965. General overviews of higher education are found in 12 of the volumes discussed; 12 deal with students; 10 are concerned with faculty; 10 focus on international and comparative education; 9 on types of institutions; 8 involve the general problems of administration; 7 collegiate curricula. There are 4 histories, 3 books about teaching, 2 biographies, and 6 are uncategorized. Each of the annotations average about 200 words, and a bibliography of 86 items is included.

14. Pattillo, M. M., "Accreditation as a Protection Against Pressures." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 31, p. 301-06. June, 1960.

The author cites instances of institutions protecting themselves against local outside political pressures by threatening possible loss of accreditation for the school. He also states his belief that accrediting agencies may play some role in preventing undesirable Federal regulation in higher education.

See also:

15. Dobbins, Charles G., ed., The University, the City, and Urban Renewal: Report of a Regional Conference Sponsored by the American Council on Education and The West Philadelphia Corporation, Philadelphia, March 25, 1963. Washington, American Council on Education, 1963. 58 p.

16. Frankel, Charles, "New Initiatives in International Education." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 37, No. 3, p. 121-28. March, 1966.

17. Munger, Frank J., and Richard F. Fenno, Jr., National Politics and Federal Aid to Education. Syracuse, New York, Syracuse University Press, 1962. 193 p.

18. Pattillo, Manning M. and Donald M. Mackenzie, Eight Hundred Colleges Face the Future: A Preliminary Report of the Danforth Commission of Church Colleges and Universities. St. Louis, Mo., Danforth Foundation, 1965. 74 p.

19. Pegues, Franklin J., "Editorial: Mobility and the Expansion of Quality." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 37, No. 3, p. 163-65. March, 1966.

20. Watson, John H., III, Industry Aid to Education, A Research Report from the Conference Board: Public Affairs Study No. 1. New York, National Industrial Conference Board, 1965. 94 p.

The Interinstitutional Movement

21. Anderson, Wayne W., Cooperation Within American Higher Education. Washington, Association of American Colleges, 1964. 74 p.

This pamphlet contains listings of interinstitutional cooperative arrangements in undergraduate education, which were compiled on the basis of 300 inquiries to university and college administrators. The listing offers a short description of the program and a communications officer's address for 83 diverse cooperative relationships: bilateral agreements, area, state, and regional clusters, and national groupings. In addition, there are identifications of cooperative programs in other specific areas: adult education, non-Western studies, research, and secondary education.

22. Donovan, George F., "The Philosophy of Interinstitutional Cooperation in American Higher Education." George F. Donovan, ed., College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation, p. 3-18. Washington, Catholic University of America, 1965.

The author attempts to identify the characteristics of interinstitutional cooperation from the chief executive officer's point of view. The emphasis is on multilateral relationships rather than bilateral programs or university centers. Discussed are the major characteristics, purposes, challenges, and opportunities afforded by interinstitutional cooperation. Information was sought informally from existing relationships. The author sees interinstitutionalism as a major balance to public control and constructs an oligopolistic, self-regulating model of higher education.

23. Fitzroy, Herbert W. K., "Regional Cooperative Programs; Twenty-Four Virginia Institutions." George F. Donovan, ed., College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation. Washington, Catholic University of America, 1965.

The author, president of the University Center in Virginia, discusses the various kinds of cooperative relationships, both incidental and formal, which have emerged in higher education. He distinguishes between "disassociated actions of cooperation" and programs designed to upgrade an institution's educational capacity. He describes the many programs offered by the Virginia center, emphasizing its Research Council established to overcome limited opportunities for research in small colleges.

24. Jamrich, John X., "Interinstitutional Cooperation in Research and Instruction." College and University, vol. 40, No. 1, p. 25-34. Fall 1964.

The premise of the article is that despite continuing support for institutional autonomy, colleges are rapidly entering cooperative relationships. The inadequacies of the isolated college, the need to achieve economies, the necessity to conserve human resources, and opportunities to expand research have led to increased cooperation. New programs take into account geographic proximity, program similarities, and common commitments among participants. The basic question continually presented is whether colleges are willing to research their needs and then to seek amelioration through the cooperative device. Existing programs in instruction, research, service, and general planning present examples of potential areas for cooperation. From effective cooperation come the possibilities of specialization in depth, efficient use of resources, better student programs, and greater influence for the college involved.

25. Johnson, Eldon L., "College Federations." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 36, No. 1, p. 1-9. January, 1966.

The author maintains that the distinctive college grouping is one which can effectively decide what to undertake in common, initiate and conduct imaginative and relevant projects, command enough resources to act, and reconcile central and peripheral power harmoniously and in mutual dependence. Effective communication appears to be the key to purposeful cooperation; it can be the biggest problem or provide the greatest benefits. Since the chief trouble with cooperation among colleges is that the program has little influence in the personal and academic lives of constituents, the author calls for ambitious and fundamental projects, an interlocking system of specialities, a jointly sponsored new college, or a joint research institute.

26. Koenker, Robert H., "Interinstitutional Co-operation at the Graduate Level." Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual Midwest Conference on Graduate Study and Research, p. 51-82. Iowa City, Iowa, Midwest Graduate Study and Research Foundation, 1962.

A list of predominantly bilateral graduate level cooperative arrangements of 112 colleges and universities. The names and descriptive data were supplied from the institutions which the author contacted in a 1961 study. The author notes that out of 151 institutions which did not have cooperative relationships in graduate work at the time of the study, one-third of them were in the process of developing such arrangements.

27. Kroepsch, Robert H. and Stephen M. Kaplan, "Interstate Cooperation and Coordination in Higher Education." Logan Wilson, ed., Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education, p. 174-90. Washington, American Council on Education, 1965.

The three major interstate compacts in higher education, the New England Board of Higher Education, the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, and the Southern Regional Education Board, are reviewed. Their birth, evolution, legal mandates, organization and financing are compared as they have pursued the mission of helping states and institutions pool their resources. The most successful pattern of cooperation has come when every participating segment feels that it will gain from the involvement. The major issues in regional education are the consequence of different perspectives on program.

28. Messersmith, James C., "Consortia and Related Institutional Arrangements." Logan Wilson, ed., Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education, p. 142-54. Washington, American Council on Education, 1965; and "Ideas and Patterns for Future Programs of Interinstitutional Cooperation." Current Issues in Higher Education, p. 150-53. 1962.

The current rapid expansion of the cooperative movement is presented within the framework of a classification system. (Cooperatives are bilateral and multilateral, research centers, inter- and intrastate efforts, urban cooperative ventures, and programs with outside agencies.) According to the author, the major problems ahead arise from inadequate reporting and inappropriate leadership: information should regularly be made available on planning, administration, financing and evaluation; and cooperative executives must promote trust, sharing and institutional self-studies. Properly oriented administrators are offered guidelines for the establishment of cooperative programs: analysis of mutual benefits, study of mutual needs, establishment of continuing interinstitutional communication, delineation of institutional roles, and appropriate reporting. Broader, more formalized geographic groupings with specialized staffs are predicted, as are new programs, and links with government and industry. The twofold purpose of cooperative activity is to upgrade quality and to direct resources to national problems.

29. Millett, John D., "State Planning for Higher Education." Educational Record, p. 223-30. Summer 1965.

The author, chancellor of the Ohio State Board of Regents and chairman of the ACE's Commission on Administrative Affairs, tells from personal experience of fears and pressures in higher education which have produced the trend toward statewide planning. The pressures include the meeting of increased costs, expanded enrollments, declining quality, and unused opportunities for research; the fears relate to apprehensions about obtaining needed plant, personnel, and budget. Educational objectives defined in terms of performance achieved with a given input of resources rather than quantitative indicators (expressed in dollars, teaching loads, or research programs) should become the standard if quality in higher education is to be maintained, the author asserts.

30. "Cooperative Relations in Higher Education." School and Society, vol. 94, No. 227, 43 p. April, 1966.

Directed toward higher education administrators, the articles in this special double issue were presented at the 53rd Schoolmen's Week Conference at the University of Pennsylvania. William E. Cadbury, Jr. exemplifies cooperative relations involving liberal arts colleges by describing nine different arrangements. He indicates that the real use of cooperation--to enrich the intellectual lives of students and faculties--is only now beginning. Clyde E. Blocker calls for increased communication to facilitate the essential cooperation between two-year and four-year colleges and suggests that four-year institutions determine what problems exist and find effective ways of working them out with the two-year colleges. Past interactions between the Government and institutions of higher education are briefly reviewed by John W. Shirley who points out possible deleterious effects on students, faculties, and institutions poised by burgeoning federally sponsored research. Predicting ever-growing Federal support, he urges both educators and Government to face up to the issues.

31. Wittich, John J., ed., College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation: Proceedings of a Conference on College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation, held at Princeton, N.J., 1962. Corning, N.Y., College Center of the Finger Lakes, 1962. 87 p.

Comprising this conference were officers involved with two patterns of interinstitutional cooperation: college centers, which may involve totally dissimilar colleges whose prime common element is their geographic proximity, and associations of colleges which are physically removed from each other but come together to attack common problems. The national status of interinstitutional cooperation was seen as being rapidly growing and academically oriented. Among the devices employed to discover and initiate projects, the following were considered significant: convening individual departmental representatives and departmental committees; holding interfaculty conferences; and collectively analyzing pooled committee reports which explore potential areas for cooperation. The use of "seed money" to stimulate new cooperative projects was advocated, while established groups were urged to use consultants, incorporate, and undertake small scale ventures without waiting for outside financial support.

Cooperation Among Special Interest Groups

32. Dominic, Sister Rose, "Cooperation Among Colleges for Religious." George F. Donovan, ed., College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation, p. 19-33. Washington, Catholic University of America Press, 1965.

This is a discussion of the establishment of the Sister Formation Conference and its cooperative programs in Roman Catholic institutions involved in Sister education. Higher education of limited quality in these 93 institutions is related to their size, isolation, and increased number. Cooperative programs are advanced as the solution and an outline of what this involves is presented.

33. Fitzroy, Herbert W. K., Interinstitutional Cooperation: Hopes and Reality. Richmond, University Center in Virginia, 1962. 13 p.

After emphasizing the need for cooperation among the relatively small, modestly endowed colleges--which must absorb the increasing enrollments in higher education--the article explains why cooperative programs have succeeded at the University Center in Virginia. The text was an address delivered to the Conference on College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation, Princeton, N.J., April 1962.

34. Hill, Alfred T., "Cooperation Among Small Colleges." George F. Donovan, ed., College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation, p. 34-46. Washington, Catholic University of America Press, 1965.

The author, executive secretary of the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, offers data from a questionnaire returned by 60 small colleges indicating that 4 small colleges in 10 are already engaged in cooperative programs and 2 are considering the idea. Even more colleges would be involved, it is said, if practical matters such as scheduling and tuition could be adjusted. Suggested is a "master teacher" to be shared by a group of developing colleges.

35. McGrath, Earl J., ed., Cooperative Long-Range Planning in Liberal Arts Colleges. New York, Institute of Higher Education, 1964. 108 p.

The presentations in this book were conference papers delivered by liberal arts college presidents. The central concern was the administrative means to achieve greater institutional excellence and financial security. Policy development as a joint faculty-administration undertaking is discussed, and ways to promote institutional research and to better define the educational purpose for liberal arts colleges are pointed out as relevant for interinstitutional cooperation.

36. _______________, The Predominantly Negro Colleges and Universities in Transition. New York, Institute of Higher Education, 1965. 204 p.

This is a complete institutional analysis of the 123 predominantly Negro colleges and universities in the United States which enroll over half of all Negroes attending institutions of higher education. In addition to plant, curricula, and instructional programs, it covers the context to which higher education for Negroes exists. These institutions vary widely in quality and character, and generally suffer from inadequate financial and personnel resources. The author recommends maintaining and strengthening most if not all of these institutions and advocates wide employment of interinstitutional cooperation as an upgrading device.

37. Meeth, L. Richard. "Breaking Racial Barriers, Part II: Interinstitutional Cooperative Program Between Colleges for Negroes and Colleges for Whites." The Journal of Higher Education, vol. 37, No. 4, p. 211-17. April, 1966.

One in a three-part series on the Negro student in higher education, written mainly for administrators. Differentiated are cooperative programs which are denominationally run, regionally constructed, and those which are cross-regional in emphasis. Programs of each type are enumerated and described. The problem of the concentration of nearly all cooperative programs in a few of the more "established" predominantly Negro institutions in also touched upon.

38. Poorman, Richard O., C.S.C., "The Small College: A Second Look." The Catholic Education Review, vol. 63, No. 3, p. 145-56. March, 1965.

The author is the assistant vice president for academic affairs at Notre Dame University and writes in reaction to the proliferation of small Roman Catholic Colleges. He enumerates the pressures for establishing these colleges as well as the problems in quality and quantity which result. Characteristics of underdevelopment, especially those related to Roman Catholic colleges, are identified. The article is addressed to Church governing boards as an appeal for a refocusing from quantity to quality in Roman Catholic higher education.

39. Rose, Harold M., "Teacher-Exchange Programs." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 37, No. 6, p. 319-24. June, 1966.

This article discusses some of the problems of interaction encountered when northern institutions cooperate with predominantly Negro institutions. The author tries to ascertain the climate for North-South interinstitutional cooperation in various types of institutions. He discusses problems in programs of teacher exchanges, differentiating three types of teacher exchanges and the kinds of institutions which find each most suitable. He notes the difference in development among predominantly Negro colleges and makes suggestions for more appropriate future cooperative programs.

40. Salerno, Sister M. Dolores, Patterns of Interinstitutional Cooperation in American Catholic Higher Education--1964. Washington, Catholic University of America Press, 1966. 292 p.

This study covers the universe of Catholic higher education engaged in interinstitutional cooperation. The type, size, regional distribution, and administration of 155 cooperative programs are described. Bilateral and multilateral programs are analyzed separately. Selective successful programs are presented along with discussion of advantages and disadvantages experienced by participating colleges. The author documents a rapid growth in cooperation both among Catholic institutions and in wider ecumenical circles. While much cooperation among colleges in close proximity is noted, distance does not seem to be a barrier.

41. Stewart, W. Blair, "Cooperation Among Liberal Arts Colleges." Liberal Education, vol. 46, No. 1, p. 66-71. March, 1960.

In improving the educational process, urges the author, cooperative relationships can contribute most to higher education. The cooperative design, conduct, and evaluation of educational experiments give promise of upgrading instruction and of maturing attitudes and procedures. Hampshire College in Western Massachusetts is pointed out as exemplifying the right direction for cooperative efforts. Programs of the Associated Colleges of the Midwest are used to illustrate how cooperation can improve quality, permit specialization, and provide financial savings.

42. _______________, "Cooperation by Independent Colleges: The Associated Colleges of the Midwest." Liberal Education, vol. 47, No. 3, p. 360-66. October, 1961.

Using the Associated Colleges of the Midwest as an example, its Director describes the "economies of scale" that can result from relevant interinstitutional cooperation. Basically, these economies are created by a fuller utilization of physical and human resources made possible by combining the facilities of colleges which have common needs and desires. Many situations where cooperation is relevant involve such economies and still allow the colleges to "retain the educational advantages they see in restricted enrollments."

See also:

43. Expanding Opportunities/The Negro and Higher Education. American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1965.

44. Meeth, L. Richard, "Breaking Racial Barriers, Part I: Interracial Student-Exchange Programs." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 37, No. 3, p. 137-43. March, 1966.

Earlier Studies in Interinstitutional Cooperation

45. Klein, Arthur J. and Franklin V. Thomas, Co-operation and Coordination in Higher Education. Washington, American Council on Education, 1938; and Sanford, Daniel S., Jr., Interinstitutional Agreements in Higher Education. New York, Bureau of Publication, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1934.

The above studies represent two of the earliest works on interinstitutional cooperation.

46. Eckert, Ruth E., "Patterns of Interinstitutional Cooperation." Current Issues in Higher Education, p. 96-102. Washington, Association for Higher Education, 1953.

A comprehensive overview of interinstitutionalism as it had developed to the early fifties. Pressures are listed, programs are categorized, geographical considerations are delineated, and 10 principles involved in establishing cooperative relationships are listed. The author's basic concern in this address is with the use of cooperation to develop academic excellence.

47. Ertell, Merton W., Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education. Albany, University of the State of New York, the State Education Department, 1957. 118 p.

This volume summarizes interinstitutional cooperation in New York

State, listing and describing all programs which were initiated before 1957. References to programs outside of the state are also included. Interinstitutionalism is discussed for its potential for expansion and specialization in higher education. Recommendations are for greater voluntary cooperation especially in nonacademic areas. Appended is a comprehensive bibliography.

48. Martorana, S. V., James C. Messersmith, and Lawrence O. Nelson, Cooperative Projects Among Colleges and Universities. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1961. OE-50020, Circular No. 649, 45 p.

The publication provides a case-history description of some successful programs of interinstitutional cooperation, their scope of operation, the character of cooperative arrangements, administrative procedures, provisions for evaluation, and qualitative factors. Bilateral and multilateral cooperative agreements on the local, state, and regional levels are documented. Two U.S. Office of Education conferences on interinstitutional cooperation are discussed. Factors conducive and deterrent to cooperative arrangements are explained, and principles and guidelines for the establishment of interinstitutional programs are presented. The authors also include a selective bibliography covering the period 1957-61.

49. Newsom, Carroll V., "Furthering Interinstitutional Cooperation." Addresses on Current Issues in Higher Education, 1951, p. 79-83. Washington, National Education Association, 1951.

Report on trends in cooperation as seen in 1951, especially concerning programs in New York State. The futility of institutional competition is cited, and programs in teacher education, community instruction, international relations, educational broadcasting, and library cooperation are proposed.

50. Western Governors' Conference, Western Regional Cooperation in Higher Education. Chicago, Council of State Governors, 1951. 30 p.

This report enumerates the factors which brought about the formation of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education in 1949. WICHE is a cooperative program in professional education, modeled after the Southern Regional Education Board. The WICHE program is spelled out along with a projected profile of higher education for the region.

Educational Functions

51. EDUCOM. Bulletin of the Interuniversity Communications Council, I, 1966.

EDUCOM, supported by a grant from the Kellogg Foundation, seeks to encourage and coordinate university use of the information sciences. The project aims to devise practical programs for harnessing "electronic thinking tools" to college curricula, research projects, and administrative services. This Bulletin appears monthly.

52. Deitch, Kenneth M., Seymour Harris, and Alan Levensohn, eds., Challenge and Change in American Education. Berkeley, Calif., McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1965.

A collection of essays by 33 educators attending the Harvard seminar on American education (1961-62) which focuses on Government involvement in educational planning and management. The discussions question which level of Government control can most effectively assist higher education in increasing quality. One essay suggests the outdatedness of state education departments and the need to reorganize them as "clearinghouses" to coordinate Federal and local activities. Others are concerned about the appropriation of Federal education funds: should they be made directly to the institutions or disbursed through the states? Also seriously questioned was the use of tests as the critical factor for college admissions.

53. Henderson, Algo D., Policies and Practices in Higher Education. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1960. 321 p.

The text, originating from a University of Michigan course taught by the author and intended primarily as a text for college teaching and administration preparation, discusses the changing concepts and purposes of higher education in terms of more fully developing human resources. In particular, it raises questions concerning the nature and quality of programs to be offered in order to accommodate students of varying intellectual abilities, as well as administrative and financial problems related to broadening the base of higher education.

54. Innovation and Experimentation in Education, A Progress Report of the Panel on Educational Research and Development to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, the Director of the National Science Foundation, and the Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1964. 79 p.

This panel was charged with exploring the contribution that research and development could make to educational needs. Negro college presidents and professors, invited to present a program of action, first offered the suggestion of linking northern universities with predominantly Negro colleges in the South. Ideas associated with Jerrold R. Zacharias, chairman of the panel, concerning curricular and pedagogical reform, as well as experimental systems and services for education are discussed in detail. This document provides the direction for much of the interinstitutional cooperation that has occurred since 1964. Particularly valuable are the remarks of author Ralph Ellison in the appendix, which provide balance to an otherwise mechanical approach.

55. Riesman, David, "Alterations in Institutional Attitudes and Behavior." Logan Wilson, ed., Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education, p. 66-73. Washington, American Council on Education, 1965.

The author notes the elites in the academic guilds and their power over presidents and universities. He indicates that segments of the faculty pull their loyalties away from the administration and community while the administration and the student body sink into provincialism and parochialism. The author stresses the need for research and development in higher education itself, while warning that the ranks of the teacher-scholars must be increased vis-à-vis the teacher-researchers.

56. Schultz, Raymond E., and W. Hugh Stickler, "Vertical Extension of Academic Programs in Institutions of Higher Education." Educational Record, p. 231-41. Summer, 1965.

The authors, both professors of higher education at Florida State University, survey the general phenomenon of vertical extension in programming to the four-, five-, and six-year levels. Implicit in their study are the standards and institutional characteristics and planning procedures which effect the relative success or failure of an individual expansion program. Also implicit are recommendations for assessing the capability of an institution to face the problem of vertical extension.

57. Taylor, R. Robb, ed., University and Community, Proceedings of a Conference of the Association of Urban Universities. April, 1963. 147 p.

The proceedings of this conference were directed toward determining those areas of research and evaluation where urban universities could make a "unique contribution in assisting urban areas in meeting their underlying needs." Research and development in industry, special responsibilities toward the culturally deprived, and guidance of urban policy decisions were the specific topics under consideration. There was also investigation of university urban studies programs which emphasized the need for training urban professionals with an interdisciplinary background.

See also:

58. The Administration of Federally Sponsored University Research: Papers Presented at the Conference on Administration of Federally Sponsored University Research, Atlanta, Georgia, April 29 - May 1, 1962. Atlanta, Southern Regional Education Board, 1963. 43 p.

59. Conflicts Between the Federal Research Programs and the Nation's Goals for Higher Education: Eighteenth Report by the Committee on Government Operations. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1965. 74 p.

60. Meeth, L. Richard, "Breaking Racial Barriers, Part III: Scholarships for Negro Students in Predominantly White Colleges and Universities." Journal of Higher Education, vol. 37, No. 5, p. 246-52. May, 1966.

61. Summary of State Legislation Affecting Higher Education in the South. Atlanta, Southern Regional Education Board, 1965. 40 p.

62. Weinberg, Meyer, ed., Learning Together: A Book on Integrated Education. Chicago, Integrated Education Associates, 1964. 222 p.

63. The White House Conference on Education: Consultants Papers, vol. 1. July 20-21, 1965. 78 p.

64. Wiggins, Samuel P., The Desegregation Era in Higher Education. Berkeley, Calif., McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1966. 106 p.

Case Studies

65. Associated Midwest Universities: Organization - Program - Activities. February, 1965. 27 p.

This booklet is directed to faculty members and graduate students. It describes the functions of the AMU as a mechanism for cooperation between member colleges and the Argonne National Laboratory. Possible areas for future cooperation are advanced.

66. Buszek, Beatrice, "Cornell University and Hampton Institute." Expanding Opportunities - The Negro and Higher Education, vol. 2, No. 1. Washington, American Council on Education, January, 1965.

The cooperative relationship between Cornell and Hampton is described from the latter's point of view. Possibilities for future activity are included. Most noteworthy is the frank expression of the pitfalls in a one-way exchange from the big university to the small college.

67. "The Compact for Education: Views from Higher Education." Educational Record, vol. 47, No. 1, p. 79-121. Winter, 1966.

Four articles about the Compact and its final text present pro and con arguments as well as descriptive data. Allan M. Cartter reviews the development and implementation of the idea from the 1964 publication of James B. Conant's Shaping Educational Policy to the unofficial adoption of the Educational Commission a year later. The dissenting arguments and fears from higher education are presented, along with the author's assessment of the calculated risk of involving political leaders in the nationwide planning of education.

The father of the concept, James B. Conant, suggests that the Educational Commission can assist universities in developing minimum standards for the licensing and operation of all institutions of higher education, expand opportunities for graduate study, present issues and facts about the "junior college problem," and review the demands upon universities for public service and their resultant problems. Conant feels that the type of relation between the Commission and higher education is dependent largely on the cooperation of administrators of the Compact and professors in outstanding institutions.

In direct opposition to Conant's views, Herbert Longenecker, president of Tulane University, explains widely held reservations. Not only do administrators and professors disapprove of the "small group" development of the Compact and the underrepresentation of higher education at the September 1965 ratification meeting, they also fear the governmental power it endorses. Longenecker points out that state suggested standards of accreditation are antithetical to the needed self-governance of colleges and universities. The Compact contains no limitations on the range of subjects upon which policy can be "recommended" and also provides for the transmittal of these suggestions to the appropriate governmental agency. Longenecker fears that this concentration of power may be detrimental to the future of American higher education. A college or university cannot become in effect an agency of the Government without losing the independence essential for carrying on its true educational functions. He encourages any state which has not yet ratified the Compact not to do so.

An endorsement of the power which the states would gain is presented by James Allen, Commissioner of Education of the State of New York. To continue the local-state-national balance of educational power, while realizing the inevitability of increased Federal participation in education, leads to a recognition of the need for strengthening state programs, he believes. Although he does not view the Compact as an action body, Allen feels that it will provide for needed support without diluting the strong influence of the universities.

68. The Cooperative Program in the Humanities, Report Number Two: An Account and an Invitation. Duke University and the University of North Carolina, 1965. 59 p.

Started in 1963 with a Ford Foundation grant, 11 institutions in Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina are linked to Duke and Chapel Hill to strengthen the region's teaching in the humanities. The 1965-66 program included 16 fellowships for teachers from participating institutions, 8 student replacement teachers sent out from Duke University and the University of North Carolina; 4 visiting professors and 2 editorial interns. Evaluations by participants are also included.

69. Fitzroy, Herbert W. K., Cooperation Among All of the Institutions in an Area. Richmond, University Center in Virginia, 1964. 5 p.

Descriptions of the programs currently in operation at the University Center in Virginia are presented by the president of the center. Also pointed out are problems that have been encountered and programs that are anticipated. This statement was originally made before a panel at the 1964 American Council on Education meeting in San Francisco.

70. Jolly, Joan, and Charles E. Madden, Amplified Telephone as a Teaching Medium. Columbia, Mo., Stephens College, 1965. 69 p.

The 1963-64 interinstitutional tele-lecture series coordinated at Stephens College, Mo., is explained and evaluated in terms of technical and instructional benefits and drawbacks.

71. Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education, Profiles of Member Colleges and Universities. 2nd ed. 20 p.

Prepared to introduce students to the Kansas City area colleges and universities, this booklet provides general information and highly informative profiles of the 16 member institutions of the Kansas City Regional Council.

72. 19th Annual Report of the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies, Inc., for the year ending June 30, 1965.

A report on the activities of the Oak Ridge Institute (composed of 40 southern universities and the Oak Ridge National Laboratory) for the 1964-65 school year. Information provided clearly shows the interaction of the Federal Government and the associated universities on the institute's activities: fellowships in nuclear science, engineering and health physics; a program for faculty research at several AEC laboratories; a traveling lecture program, a postdoctoral fellowship program; a student trainee program; a medical division; and institutes for special training.

73. Pfautz, Harold W., Narrative Report of the Brown-Tougaloo Cooperative Program, a report made to the Fund for the Advancement of Education. June, 1965.

A discussion of the establishment and administration of the Brown-Tougaloo program, one of the earliest and most cooperative activities linking a northern university and a predominantly Negro college. This report presents the development of the program which has become a prototype for many later cooperative efforts.

74. Salwak, Stanley F., "The Need for Cooperation and the CIC Response." Educational Record. Summer, 1964.

The development of some specific cooperative programs (biometeorology, Far Eastern languages, traveling scholars) and the history of their implementation through the Committee on Institutional Cooperation are discussed in the light of needs and benefits for the university and its greater community.

75. Southern Regional Education Board 1965/66, Annual Report, 1965-66. Atlanta, The Board. 32 p.

This annual report contains a description of established and planned programs aimed at upgrading the quality of education in the South. Although the long-range purpose of the SREB is to improve all universities, the report of the 1965 Policy Committee suggests emphasis on studying and developing Negro colleges to improve and increase their role in providing public education. Listings of universities and colleges cooperating in various SREB programs are given according to area of cooperation.

76. Stoke, Stuart M., "Cooperation at the Undergraduate Level." George F. Donovan, ed., College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation. Washington, Catholic University of America Press, 1965.

The author, who is the coordinator of the program between Amherst, Mt. Holyoke, Smith, and the University of Massachusetts, discusses what can be accomplished comparatively between institutions of approximately the same level of development and close geographical proximity. The absence of any extended cooperation between departments and the basically ad hoc nature of the entire program appear as the underlying limitations in the existing arrangement.

See also:

77. "The Emphasis is on Practicality." Industrial Development, p. 39-51. August, 1963.

78. First Annual Report of the Inter-University Program: The University of Buffalo, Cornell University, the University of Rochester, Syracuse University. June, 1962.

79. The Inter-University Council of the Dallas and Fort Worth Metropolitan Areas, Annual Reports, 1964 and 1965. Glenn C. Sparks, "Academic Institutions in North Texas Organize for Cooperation." Reprint from the Texas Library Journal. Spring, 1965.

80. New England Board of Higher Education, Annual Reports of 1962, 1963, 1964. New England's Academic Common Market. Washington, Committee for the Advancement of School Administration, American

Association of School Administrators, 1963. 28 p. Regional Cooperation in New England Higher Education: The First Five Years of NEBHE. Winchester, Mass., New England Board of Higher Education, 1965. 24 p. Proceedings of NEBHE Workshop on Institutional Research, Reports of 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965.

A SYSTEMS APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF THE INTERNAL PROBLEMS AND THE EXTERNAL RELATIONSHIPS OF THE UNIVERSITY

Daniel Katz
Professor of Psychology
University of Michigan

All living systems including social organizations are open systems in that they are continuously receptive to certain types of input or environmental influence and continuously affecting their social environment through their outputs They vary in degree of openness to their surroundings from relatively encapsulated systems which are little more than maintenance and survival structures to systems which are so permeable and ill-defined in their boundaries as apparently to fuse at times with their environment. A doctrinaire political group like the Socialist Labor Party is an example from the closed end of the continuum in that it takes little account of changes in the social world and has little impact upon it. It lives by rattling the bones of its dead heroes and leaders of the past. The modern university on the other hand, though not at the other pole of complete openness, is somewhere in that part of the continuum which is constantly affecting and being affected by immediate forces in the outside world.

Though the university's two major functions are the creation of new knowledge and the socialization of young people in this knowledge it carries on a range of activities which are only incidental to these major functions--activities which are often demands of the larger society. Thus it enters into the area of the application of knowledge to applied problems of government and industry--activities sometimes indistinguishable from the work of industry and government. Some of its sub-groups, though not necessarily officially representative, become involved in political activities as in the case of student newspapers taking positions on political issues. It is also open to new inputs in the way of federal grants so that state universities have increasingly supplemented their budgets from the federal programs. And changes in the political complexion of the state government can have a direct and immediate effect upon the state university as in the case of the recent firing of President Clark Kerr of the University of California. In fact the tendency of some state officials is to see the university as an agency of the state government subject to the same restrictions and controls as any other agency. Thus its new buildings may be subject to the approval of state architects in terms of the formulae they use for all buildings whether or not these formulae have any relevance for the type of research and teaching facilities needed by a given university. Another example of system openness at the university level is seen in the type of applied research required by the larger society. If $10 million are made available by the auto industry for a research institute on traffic safety and there are a few faculty members interested in the research possibilities, then a university may accept the grant. No single grant may alter the on-going system but the cumulation of such inputs does affect the character of the university.

One basic dilemma of the university as a social system concerns the continual pressures for system openness to maintain support from the outside environment as contrasted with the need to emphasize its own functions and keep the system boundaries clear so that it does not overlap and become co-terminus with all society. The push toward complete openness comes not only from the desire to utilize all available outside resources. It comes also from the character of an institution interested in creating and imparting knowledge. For one thing outside agencies want to utilize the research knowledge and the specialized skill of its personnel. From the President's Council of Economic Advisers on down, the government seeks help on its problems. Industry wants to apply specialized research from the academic setting. For another thing, the pursuit of knowledge means that the university personnel - both staff and students - are often interested in the application of their ideas to current economic, social and political issues. The academic community, for example, has shown some degree of involvement in desegregation, civil rights and the war in Vietnam. The university thus has the difficult problem of its sub-groups taking positions on non-academic matters which in the eyes of the public are commitments of the university itself.

Another aspect of the system openness of the university is that university staff, especially faculty members, have a commitment to their profession which often takes priority over their commitment to a specific institution (Sanford). They are also members of their professional organizations and seek rewards and careers in the profession rather than the specific university. If they attain recognition and status in the profession, they can also achieve promotion in their own institution or a better position at another institution. If they receive rewards only in their own school, however, this does not necessarily carry prestige and status in the profession. Thus the young academician is less likely to aspire to life membership in Institution X than to a tenure position in any major institution which can provide him adequate research space and facilities, research support, stimulating colleagues, and good graduate students. And the honors conferred upon him by his own professional organization in scientific awards may mean more than the citation by his own university for distinguished service to it. In other words, staff members have dual membership. They belong both to their own institutions and to the professional system which cuts across universities. In an affluent society with growing college enrollments, the membership in the larger profession becomes especially important and mobility across institutions becomes the order of the day.

A related dimension to system openness is the degree of organizational tightness of the many parts of the structure. An army or a hospital or an industrial plant is tightly organized in that the interdependencies of the parts, their subordination and superordination and their functional operations are specified under a centralized system of control. The centralized control, moreover, extends to most of the activities within the system so that there is little formal autonomy for any of the sub-systems. The major American political parties are something of a contrast in that there is not much articulation between local, state and national organizations representing the name of the same political party. Even at the national level there is the presidential party and the congressional party. The major American political parties, then, are coalitions of many relatively independent structures which present a formal united front only for the election of the president.

The large American university or multiversity has moved in the direction of the political system rather than the industrial system in the looseness of its centralized control and in the degree of autonomy permitted to sub-groups within the structure. The control of student activities and of student life is increasingly being delegated to student groups with faculty advisers. The educational policies are heavily determined not by a centralized administration but by the component schools and colleges of the university and even by the departments within a college. The administrative budgetary controls take on less significance now that departments, research centers and individual professors can find support for their activities and research from foundations, industry and the federal government. The university exerts control in general only in asking for its overhead from outside grants and contracts. Exceptions of course can be cited such as Princeton University but I am talking about a general trend--a trend exemplified by the readiness of universities to accept any support which individual operators in the university can secure whether it is for the defense department like the ill-fated Camelot project or for industry and the community as in the case of studies of traffic safety.

A second dilemma of the university is the conflict between its formal structure and its informal functioning with respect to control and coordination and relevant decision-making. I have described the loosely articulated structure of the university with its decentralized decision-making but this is mostly on the informal, de facto side. Formally the power and control is heavily centralized with a Board of Trustees in a monopolistic position with respect to decision-making. Much of this power is delegated, however, to the top administration of the university --sometimes formally, sometimes informally. In turn the central administration delegates power to schools and colleges and other agencies and again there is a further delegation to departments and other sub-units. Thus many universities, though they may operate democratically with respect to certain types of decisions, are not representative democracies in a formal sense. At times, then, there are conflicts between the informal structures legitimized by practice and by the consent of those higher in the system and the formal power and control structure. One aspect of this conflict is the role which many university administrators perceive as their major function--the role of mediator or compromiser with respect to the demands of the many sub-groups (Katz and Kahn). Instead of a role of policy initiation and development, they see their task as one of adjudicating conflict, of compromising differences, of making concessions; in short, of holding the system together. In mediating competing claims for resources, the principle of compromise can work fairly well, but when demands are of an ideological or moral character, the techniques of arbitration can break down. There is an all-or-none character about a moral issue which is not solved by a partial concession. Administrators find that neither faculty nor student groups are satisfied by a conciliatory move which in fact would compromise the position of the protestors. Hence some administrations, like labor mediators, will seek to avoid formulations of problems in moral and symbolic terms.

The de facto decentralization also leads administrators to an acceptance of a mode of operation which I have called progressive commitment, and which Braybrooke and Lindholm have termed incrementalism. Instead of policy being set by a full consideration of the problem, the assessment of alternatives and their costs and consequences, the policy is determined by a series of decisions made in various parts of the organization often for limited issues unrelated to the major problem now confronting the system. These many smaller decisions constitute progressive commitment so that the administrator is left with little freedom of action for a major policy decision. For example, some faculty members and students at some universities do not believe that universities should cooperate with the Selective Service System by compiling class rankings of its students. They feel that it is not part of the university function to assist the agencies of the government in the conduct of an undeclared war. But administrators are quick to point out that there is no area of freedom left on this problem. The separate colleges long ago adopted grading systems, they decided to make transcripts of grades available to the student and they decided in the past to have the registrar's office compile class standing for various fellowship purposes. Hence this information now available to the student cannot be held back if the student wants to use it for securing draft deferment. Another example of incrementalism is the acceptance of research grants one at a time from government and industry which cumulatively change the character of a university from an institution with heavy emphasis upon undergraduate teaching to a far flung graduate enterprise with a fair proportion of the staff not to be found on the central campus during any one month of a semester. Progressive commitment can occur without decentralization but it is aided and abetted by local decision making. Thus in the example just cited there was no policy decision to convert to a large scale research enterprise funded by governmental and industrial sources. So long as freedom was permitted for the individual staff member or sub-unit to seek their own research support, the cumulative decisions changed the nature of the system.

The dilemma of a formal centralized control structure and an informal mode of operation in practice can at times produce sharp conflict. Issues arise which focus upon relations with the larger society. A threat from without can move the governing board or the top administration to take a position. The decision may affect staff, students and lower levels of the administration. Now they want to know why they were not consulted or given a genuine voice in the policy decision. Since some of them do make day-to-day decisions about the actual conduct of the university, their expectations exceed their formal power position. On other matters they have gotten concessions from the university administrators for their demands and they do not perceive themselves as outside the system with respect to important decisions affecting them. Hence they may mobilize their forces and attempt to change the formal authority structure of the institution. They also run the risk in such conflicts of losing some of their informal power, since it is something either delegated to them or assumed by them because of a power vacuum in the actual operations of the system.

My purpose is neither to praise nor to deplore the trends which have made the university an open, loosely articulated system which at times has ill-defined boundaries and moves toward randomness and away from a unified coordinated structure. There are advantages as well as costs in this development. But my objective is to examine these implications of the nature of the system with respect to some of the problems it faces and with respect to inter-university cooperation.

It should also be noted that there are reasons why universities take on the character they have. In the first place, their basic function of creating and imparting knowledge call for different forms of organization than the traditional machine model of industry and the military. Research and teaching cannot be maximized by centralized administrative controls.They call for freedom of inquiry, freedom of discussion, and the right to follow the pursuit of truth wherever it may lead (Parsons). Hence autonomy at local levels becomes an important requirement for carrying on these functions of the educational system. Even large industrial corporations which maintain natural science laboratories of their own have had to grant autonomy to their scientists to provide opportunity for discovery. In the second place, the amount of support for the university increases if its staff and sub-units are free to negotiate with outside agencies. No centralized administrative research agency of the university can be as effective in obtaining outside grants and contracts as the specialists on the faculty and research staffs can. The varied professional skills and knowledge reside in the academic personnel and not in any centralized administrative set-up even if recruited from the academic community. With problems of growth and the need for facilities and resources to attract and hold competent personnel, universities have been eager to obtain the additional funds available in the affluent society. In the third place, the burden of carrying on a centralized administration becomes increasingly difficult with increased student enrollment, increased faculties, and expanded activities. Universities have never been adequately staffed for carrying out their administrative functions. No large business organization would want to function without adequate administrative personnel for maintaining records on its output, on its costs, for utilizing feedback from its market to control its activities, for research and development, and for planning. Few universities have ever had staff for these functions, especially for such things as operational research and planning. This is reflected in the inadequate non-academic personnel of most universities where even the most primitive needs for secretarial assistance are shockingly disregarded. The increasing overload on administrators and the difficulty of managing the far flung enterprise have led to a willingness to grant considerable autonomy to the sub-groups and individuals in the system. Given the circumstances, it is the only way the system can operate without breakdown.

Limited as is this framework of the university as a social system, I should like to use it to point up some specific questions of present concern to its operating problems.

1. What changes should be considered in decision-making structures within universities to make for more effective functioning?

I would submit that we are suffering from cultural lag in our present power and control structure in the university. Our formal centralization of decision-making goes back to an older hierarchical principle of concentration of power at the top but in fact many decisions are made at lower levels. In the nature of the case this has to be so both because of growth in size and complexity and because of the nature of the institution. As Parsons has pointed out, the technical or professional sub-system possesses the information for professional decisions and they cannot be made adequately by the managerial subsystem. Moreover, the present mode of operation with the inherent contradiction between informal practices and formal arrangements is generative of conflict. By restructuring the system to recognize de facto decentralization, we can improve the overall functioning of the university. If faculty members and students have clear-cut roles with respect to decision-making, they will also have clear-cut responsibilities. As it is now they sometimes try to influence policy in crisis situations in a negative fashion in censuring the administration.

Such a formal change, moreover, would help the administrator who often spends considerable effort to keep his Board of Regents or Trustees from direct intervention in the daily operation of the university.

One objection to a democratically structured system with top administrators working with duly elected executive committees is the inefficiency in the time taken to reach decisions. But the amount of effort and time consumed in handling the protests and disaffection of faculty under the older system of authoritarian decisions is even less efficient.

2. How can the university respond to inputs and demands from without so as to maintain its distinctive functions and not fuse with the larger social environment?

The university must be prepared to restrict inputs which are not appropriate to its functions and to resist demands which are not legitimate requests of an educational institution. It can allocate some space, for example, to recruiting agencies of industry and government but it should not become an active agent in such recruitment. It can accept research funds but only when research findings are to be published and to become part of the scientific literature--not, however, if the research is confidential and classified. It should, of course, train people for government and industry but as part of its own educational system and not as a specific agency for outside groups. The top administrative leaders, moreover, should emphasize their institutional function, to use Parson's terminology, to handle outside pressures in terms of general issues rather than in terms of compliance with specific demands. For example, the legislature may raise questions about the costs of graduate training relative to undergraduate training but the specific percentage of funds allocated to both types of training should be worked out within the university. Finally on the output side, the university should not intervene as a university in political issues. Some sub-group within the university but not part of its decision structure, such as the Young Republicans or the Young Democrats, can take a stand but for their group only and not for the university. The university should be a place for free discussion of all types of problems, but for the university to take a position on political matters would choke off such discussions. If the university enters the political arena then it in turn can expect to be invaded by outside political forces.

In short, I would quarrel with the position taken by Senator Ribicoff, at least in its literal formulation when he addressed a university audience on February 10, 1967 as follows:

> American universities have been indifferent to the problems of urban ghettos. By refusing to get their hands dirty, by not utilizing these 'laboratories' which lie in their own backyards, they have forsaken their responsibility in this area. (Michigan Daily, February 11, 1967).

Now I believe social scientists should study important social problems, but their attack upon any given issue should be dictated in good part by their own theoretical needs. The responsibility of universities is to advance knowledge generally, and if they fail conspicuously to do so they will suffer in terms of social support and rightly so. But this does not mean that the responsibility for the solution of any given public problem, whether it be urban renewal or air pollution, is the responsibility of the university.

Changes in the formal decision structure to accord the faculty more power would help the university resist outside demands. Such a move would make the university more conservative since the faculty would be jealous of its function and would be resistant to change forces. This has been true of some European universities which are more democratically run than American universities. In fact European universities have suffered in some respects in that their faculties are too likely to perpetuate old ways even when change is necessary. They have been too closed as social systems. We have been too open and we need to shift somewhat in a conservative direction.

3. Are the major functions of the university mutually reinforcing or generative of conflict?

Much has been said and written about the research function dominating the large university to the detriment of the teaching functions. Students complain that they are taught by teaching fellows and rarely get to see a professor until their senior year. The professor is busy with his research and sees mostly his graduate students when he is actually on campus. Though there are practical problems attendant upon the changes in modern universities, there is no intrinsic conflict between teaching and research. The campus or the department in which no research is being conducted and where all efforts go just into teaching is generally a dull, dead place. The excitement of being involved in new discovery, in extending knowledge makes learning and teaching a creative process. The regurgitation of the books which others have written in the absence of the teacher's own active involvement in writing and research becomes boring after a year or two to teacher and student alike. The ideal form of learning would involve all students with their teachers in an active process of discovery, whether it be in the laboratory, the field, or in other types of projects. The problem, however, is that with increasing enrollments it is difficult to set up these types of learning processes with a shortage of staff. Nonetheless there are imaginative solutions, as in the work of Dr. Richard Mann of The University of Michigan, who sends his introductory students into child guidance centers, clinics, hospitals, poverty programs, etc., under the guidance of teaching fellows. The overall program is not a research program in the sense of statistical findings, but it is research oriented in the testing of ideas against practice and in the students' own observations and discoveries. In fine, the functions of teaching and research can be mutually reinforcing.

4. What changes in university structure are necessary to handle the increasing research function?

Just as there is a cultural lag between the formal structure and the actual decision-making going on in the system, so too is there a lag between the formal machinery and the research activities of the university. The university was built around the teaching function. State universities received their budgets from state legislatures to cover the teaching of students and not to provide staff members with the opportunities to do research. Even in some state universities where outside funds contribute as much or more than the state budget, the tendency is to see the state funds as hard core money and federal and other support as less dependable. As research has burgeoned, universities have set up research centers and institutes to permit the sustained attack upon problems by a team of researchers. University perquisites such as sabbaticals and tenure, however, go to people in teaching departments and not to researchers in centers or institutes. Research personnel are often second-class citizens in university systems. This leads to an increasing separation of research and teaching.

One way of handling the problem is to open up teaching departments to qualified members of research centers within the university. Researchers can be asked to teach in their area of competence on a regular part-time basis or on a full-time basis for some semesters when their schedules permit. Similarly, teachers in the department should be able to move over into an appropriate research center for given periods and back again to their own departments. And research personnel thus admitted to departments for limited periods should be given all the perquisites of the teaching staff. This means a greater tenure commitment on the part of the university since qualified research personnel will have the same privileges as qualified teachers. The commitment is not as frightening as administrators seem to think because the universities will continue to need more staff as the years go by.

5. What are the problems of conflict between the maintenance and technical sub-systems of the university?

The maintenance sub-system of an organization is concerned with the preservation of the set of role relationships constituting the formal structure of the organization. Its emphasis is upon dependable behavior patterns and it seeks to reduce the variability and unreliability of the human beings in carrying out their roles. The emphasis in this sub-system is upon roles, standard operating procedures, decisions based upon precedent. The technical or productive sub-system is concerned with the throughput, i.e., getting the basic work of the organization done. In almost all organizations the differential dynamics of these sub-groups clash, for the one dynamic emphasizes rule observance and the other performance. Within universities this conflict is exaggerated in that the job to be done of teaching students and of conducting research is handicapped by stereotyped procedures. The exciting relationship between student and teacher is necessarily a personal one. If it is crimped and iced it is poor education. Similarly, research cannot be conducted effectively by men punching a time clock and following the procedures of the assembly line of the factory.

The conflict is not only sharpened by the nature of the functions of the university but by the status differentials between the productive staff of teachers and researchers who are professionals and by the maintenance staff of personnel and administrative departments who are by and large non-professionals. In fact, many professionals would not regard a promotion to a high position in the maintenance structure such as a deanship as a real promotion. Moreover, the academic staff of professionals are awarded perquisites such as sabbaticals, tenure, vacations and fringe benefits not generally granted to the non-academic personnel.

A reorganization of the university which would bring the disparate worlds of the academic staff and the maintenance personnel closer would be a desirable reform. Such a restructuring might assign administrators to appropriate academic units and attempt to fuse them into a sing[illegible]r with complementary roles.

c. How can the problem of expansion and increasing enrollments be handled by changes in structure?

The problem of size can be handled by breaking up a large college into a number of small colleges, each with its own faculty and facilities. This simple formula, however, is inefficient in terms of duplication and undercuts the advantages of the large university with specialized laboratories and training facilities and expert personnel in given areas of specialization. Moreover, many students come to the large university because they see its advantages and prefer it to the small college. Otherwise they would have gone to the small college.

One possible solution is a series of small colleges in which most of the work during the first two years is given within the sub-unit but both for science courses and for specialization during the last two years students take courses in the larger university. They still have their residence in the small college but are not restricted to its walls for a good share of their work. One of the new California state universities has a variant on this pattern according to which a series of small colleges will be set up, each with its own type of specialized faculty.

7. What general principles of organizational change apply to universities?

Four such principles are worthy of note.

(a) In an environment of ample resources all open systems grow. It is extremely difficult for a university to resist such growth unless it can encapsulate itself and move toward being a closed system.

(b) Growth, while originally quantitative in that the organization does more of the same thing, hits critical points where qualitative changes take place. A university which triples in size in a 15-year period is no longer the same type of university with respect to the educational process and the interpersonal relations within it.

(c) It is easier to add organizational structures than to delete them. As the university adds staff, multiplies its departments, sets up research centers, it rarely cuts out old institutes or facilities. Once established, organizational sub-structures do not die and often do not even fade away.

(d) Organizational change is induced much more easily through new inputs than through consciously conceived internal changes. Systems do not reform themselves from within but are reformed with respect to environmental changes. New resources and new demands affect the character of the system. Internal strains may predispose toward change but they generally need to be supported by external forces impinging upon the system before restructuring takes place. Systems with a history have developed the mechanisms for handling internal strains without drastic changes in structure.

Five implications of the properties of universities as open and loosely coordinated systems for inter-university cooperation deserve consideration. In the first place, a great deal of the push for many inter-university programs must come from administrative rather than faculty sources. Faculty members as entrepreneurs are likely to give first attention to initiating their own research programs in the pursuit of their own research interests. Obtaining research support, conducting research and teaching are a fulltime undertaking and permit little marginal time for other things. Moreover, this is the sort of activity that pays off the most heavily for the man's career. Often the university administration is willing to sit back and give free rein to its enterprising staff members for the projects they want to launch. This, however, is not a reliable and substantial basis for insuring inter-university programs. The university administration must itself make a commitment. Now there are cooperative programs which will involve faculty members because of their research potential or their appeal to ideological motives. The University of Michigan has a cooperative arrangement with Tuskeegee Institute in Alabama. The arrangement provides for some exchange of students and of faculty as well as some research opportunities for staff members of both institutions. Other northern universities have similar relationships with southern institutions. The potential benefits from these plans are so great that it would be nice to report a success story of great proportions. In fact, however, I believe these cooperative arrangements have still to achieve their real potential. They lack the sustained commitment of resources necessary for the task. At the University of Michigan two dedicated social psychologists with some help from a university vice-president have given time and effort to obtain a foundation grant to set up a cooperative research institute at Tuskeegee. But basically here the story is one of too little and too late in an area which promised educational research and social payoffs.

In the second place, on the positive side the openness of universities makes possible a variety of cooperative arrangements. Since the commitment of members is more to educational and research functions than to loyalty to the symbols of a specific school, the barriers to communication and cooperation are down. Moreover, some of the resistances to cooperation across disciplines are less in an interuniversity program than within a single university.

In the third place, even though barriers are down and university boundaries are easily permeable, cooperative activities need strong positive forces, not merely the absence of negative factors. I have already pointed out the limitations of faculty members in implementing their good will, but would like to emphasize the need for activities that have a continuing functional basis to provide supportive feedback. Two colleges in physical proximity can share faculties and resources if neither one is large enough to maintain adequate offerings and educational opportunities in all fields. Or colleges can cooperate to secure visiting musical, dramatic and lecture series of high quality. There is a continuing feedback or payoff to such enterprises which gives support and stability to the enterprise.

Fourthly, open systems in an affluent environment tend to grow and expand. Mergers often result because of the efficiences of size. Cooperation across colleges and universities have implications for the merger of institutions. Western Reserve and Case University, in close physical proximity, have finally decided to merge. We can expect more developments of this kind in the future. Even some of the traditional private men's schools and women's colleges may move toward coordinated educational systems. Many state institutions face the problem of joining forces in a single system and thus follow the model of the University of California. Part of the issue is whether the advantages of presenting a single budget to the state legislature outweigh the disadvantages of the loss of autonomy.

The question of merging institutions rather than of maintaining limited programs of cooperation might well be answered in the affirmative by the formalists in organizational theory. The university, however, faces special problems with respect to growth which are even greater than other corporate bodies. The nature of its functioning demands decentralization in that the people with the most relevant information for many types of decision-making are faculty members and not top level administrators. If considerable decentralization is necessary for effective functioning, then, it may be desirable to preserve programs of cooperation of a limited type rather than to attempt to coordinate all activities within a single system.

My fifth point is, that, even though there is less commitment to the symbols of a college or university than is true in some other types of organizations, it is still important for cooperation across universities to call for equality in the social exchange process. One problem of a cooperative arrangement between a large northern university and a small southern college is that the former may assume the role of big brother. Relationships which are one-sided in character are not likely to endure. The powerful partner may obtain smug satisfaction from his superior role, but this does not provide the right type of motivation for a good relationship. The poor partner resents the favors received which he is not given a chance to reciprocate in some fashion. The reciprocity need not mean literal equality of contribution, but it should be a meaningful type of social exchange. One-sided relationships take on the character of exploitation even if benevolent in character rather than of true social exchange (Blau). This is one of the weak aspects of our foreign aid program.

REFERENCES

Blau, Peter. Exchange and Power in Social Life, (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1964)

Braybrooke, D. and Lindlom, C. E. A Strategy of Decision (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1963)

Katz, D. & Kahn, R. The Social Psychology of Organizations (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966)

Parsons, Talcott Structure and Process in Modern Societies (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1960)

Sanford, N., (ed.). The American College (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1962)

ANALYZING THE DYNAMICS OF ACADEMIC QUALITY

Robert McGinnis
Professor of Mathematical Sociology
Cornell University

Certain questions ceaselessly and properly haunt educators and academic administrators: How good are we? What can we do to improve our institutional quality? It is hardly novel to suggest that the scientific process can be brought to bear in a search for answers to these questions. This paper contains a relatively non-technical sketch of the part that statistical analysis might play in such a quest.

A necessary first task in any scientific analysis is measurement. A pursuit of the questions of institutional quality and its improvement requires two distinct but related measurement tasks. First, a useable measure of institutional quality must be constructed. Then a second but derivative measure of patterns of change in quality must be established. In this paper the first measurement problem is considered only briefly. Enough has been thought and written about it already so that we have at least some grasp on the problem of measuring institutional quality. The main thrust here is to show how a branch of mathematics, called stochastic process theory, can contribute to the solution of the second measurement problem. To spare needless agony, mathematical details are stripped to a minimum. The brief bibliography that concludes this article contains references that provide many of these rich details.

MEASURING INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY

If it is to achieve anything at all, the scientific process must begin with measurement.[1] The problem of measurement is less to use yardsticks well than to construct them properly. The problem frequently is misadvertised as one of marking off a ruler on a rubberband. In point of fact, a rubberband may be perfectly appropriate as the base for a ruler. The usefulness of the base material depends upon how much information is to be incorporated into the measure. A rubberband is an adequate base for measurement if one seeks simply to order things. An elastic scale is useless only if its purpose is to measure not just the order of things but also that order of distances between them. These are relatively sophisticated matters of scaling that are by no means the first order of business in measurement.

In the matter of measuring the quality of academic institutions, we are in mid-step, and it is a first faltering step.[2] The first procedure of measurement on a set of things is to construct a partition. A partition is a subdivision of things - let us call them elements hereafter - into a set of subclasses such that every element belongs to one subclass and no element belongs to more than one. These are just the properties of mutual exclusiveness and exhaustiveness of any elementary measurement. Trouble flairs up immediately with this sort of formalism. A reasonably small number of elements can be broken down into subclasses in an almost inexhaustable number of different ways. For example, fifteen objects can be broken down into two classes in more than thirty-two thousand different ways. The concern here is not with fifteen objects, but with more than 2,000 institutions of higher learning. The quality partition should not be dichotomous, into "good" and the "ungood." To get at the important questions about quality and its improvement, far more refinement than this is needed. Academic institutions must be partitionable at any point in time into a relatively large number of quality classes, say fifteen or twenty at a minimum, for reasons that are discussed later. Whatever the number of subclasses in the partition, the rules for subdivision must be stable.

A measurement is a rule for assigning elements to classes of a partition. A measurement is "good" if, and only if, it is stable in two senses.[3] First, a measurement must inflexibly assign a given element to a given class. This, of course, is the criterion of reliability. Second, a good measurement rule must assign to different classes only those elements that truly differ with respect to what is being measured. This is the criterion of validity. Let us discard at once any concern about the matter of reliability; not that it is unimportant, but simply that it is trivial in the present context relative to the importance of validity.

How is a valid measure of institutional quality to be established? The answer must be that, in any objective sense, it never will be. One man's academic Mecca is another man's slough of intellectual despond. Still, if any purchase is to be taken on the two overriding questions, then the fiction must be accepted that there are criteria by which the quality of colleges can be measured and evaluated.

Few would hold today that the quality of a college bears any necessary relation, for example, to the facility of its graduates in Greek or Latin. Most would agree, on the other hand, that its quality hinges somehow on the number of books from among which a student may choose to read, on the number of scholars who are available to speak to him, on the number of courses he may choose to join, or even on the number of foreign students with whom he may discourse.

Assume, for the moment at least, that there is some validating merit in the considered judgement of professional educators and academic administrators. Then careful, although probably conservative, ranking studies such as that recently conducted by the American Council on Education provide the needed validating criterion.[4] This criterion variable (which itself has reasonably high reliability with similar recent studies of academic prestige) yields a further result. Several widely available objective institutional measures turn out to be useful predictors of assessed quality. The number of available library books per capita, faculty-student ratio, the proportion of students who are foreign, and several similar institutional measures each bear an important correlation with the relative prestige that "experts" accord an institution. A study at Cornell recently has shown that three such measures, when combined, yield a multiple correlation of about .90 with a quantified version of the experts' combined rankings.[5] Validating criteria, although imperfect, thus are available. Useful and reliable objective measures, according to the validating criteria, also are available. Thus, a measurement of the quality of academic institutions can be achieved.

The first problem, however, is not entirely resolved by these facts. The measurement variables - number of library books available, number of professors about the campus, and the like - do not co-vary in a uniform fashion. Some highly esteemed institutions have relatively many books and few professors, for example. Two such measures, Ph.D. production and number of library books per capita, have a slight negative correlation. Thus, the dilemma of multidimensional analysis: several variables, all patently relevant to an assessment of academic quality, need not correlate uniformly with an accepted validating criterion. That there is no simple solution to this dilemma should be clear. There are, however, several empirical approximations of a solution. Probably the chief among these is the technique of factor analysis.

The factor analytic solution to the problem of inconsistent multidimensional measures need not be reviewed in detail here. It consists, in brief, of treating the set of intercorrelations among the criterion variables and reducing them to clusters or factors. Factor weightings can be extracted and used to assess the relative contribution to each factor of each measure. In the presence of a validating variable, such as the A. C. E. ranking measure, each factor and each of its component variables can be assigned a value that "weighs" its contribution.

All of this suggests a plan, imperfect at the very best, but probably the best that is available, for measuring the quality of American colleges. It consists first of accepting a validating criterion, such as the A. C. E. ranking of leading institutions. Objective characteristics that correlate well with it then would be put through factor analysis. Factors and individual variables subsequently could be weighted in proportion to their covariance with the validating measure. Finally, the great, wobbly leap should have to be taken that would extend these weights from the set of elite schools that actually were ranked into the great mass of those that were not.

With all of this, a "quality" partition of American institutions of higher learning could be established. No one could deny that the partition would be weak and fallible. Equally, no one could deny that it should serve at least as well as any presently competing measure.

The result of these mighty labors would be nothing more than a small string of numbers that statisticians call a probability vector.

The vector is represented sybolically as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(t) &= \left[p_{1(t)} \quad p_{2(t)} \cdots p_{i(t)} \cdots p_{n(t)}\right], \\ \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_{i(t)} & \left(= p_{1(t)} + p_{2(t)} + \ldots + P_{n(t)}\right) = 1 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The vector is referred to generically as $\alpha(t)$, where the letter t tells us that the vector characterizes the set of elements at a particular point in time. The typical element of the vector, $p_{i(t)}$, is just the proportion of elements that are in class i at time t. Thus, $\alpha(t)$ tells us the relative size of each subclass in the partition at a particular time. The second line of (1) says that the sum of the proportions must equal one, which is just another way of saying that every element must be contained in one and only one subclass of the partition at each time, t. Note that $p_{i(t)}$ is a proportion of the elements under consideration. Since proportions have exactly the same properties as do probabilities, it is perfectly admissable to use the tools of probability theory for the analysis of distribution vectors, $\alpha(t)$, and particularly for investigating the ways in which these vectors change in time.

MEASUREMENT OF CHANGE IN QUALITY

Let us make some further assumptions about $\alpha(t)$. First, of course, we must assume that it represents a useable partition of academic institutions with respect to "quality." Moreover, by the intrinsic nature of the partition, we can assume that the classes are ordered. That is, any element in class i has higher "quality" than does any element in i-1. Next, assume that the partition provides a sufficiently fine mesh such that it is possible to observe institutional shifts from position to position even over a relatively short time span. Then assume that measures are taken of the population of the institutions at each of a set of time intervals. We can set t=0 to represent arbitrarily the date of the first available measurement of the institutions. With these assumptions the problem becomes one of ordering the data in such a way as to permit an analysis of patterns of change. Once a clear picture of these patterns is established, the final scientific job of evaluating the determinants of different patterns can be undertaken. This job completed, it remains for policymakers to find ways of implementing those conditions that should yield the desired patterns of institutional change in quality.

Suppose that the quality partition contains n classes. Consider those institutions that are in, say, class i at time t. What is to be their fate at time t=1? Presumably, it is possible for any one of these institutions to be in any of the n classes of the partition at time t+1, but is certainly not reasonable to presume that these n alternative fates are equally likely. To represent these possibilities symbolically, we can construct a vector similar to that of (1), as follows:

$$B_i(t+1) = \left[P_{i1(t+1)}, \; P_{i2(t+1)}, \ldots, P_{ij(t+1)}, \ldots, \; P_{in(t+1)} \right], \qquad (2)$$
$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} P_{ij(t+1)} = 1.$$

The vector $B_i(t+1)$ gives the proportional distribution at time t+1 of those institutions that were in quality class i at time t. The typical element, $p_{ij(t+1)}$, can be interpreted as the conditional probability of an element being in class j at time t+1 given that it was in state i at time t.[6] Since every element that was in state i at time t must be in one and only one state at time t+1, the second line of (2) follows at once. Notice in particular that the value $p_{ii(t+1)}$ is just the probability of going from class i to class i, that is, of making no change over the time interval.

Since there are n different classes in the partition, there are also n different vectors of the form $B_{i(t+1)}$. It is useful to combine these vectors into a single mathematical entity, a matrix. The matrix so constructed is a rectangular array of conditional probabilities that can be represented as follows:

$$P(t) = \begin{vmatrix} p_{11(t)} & p_{12(t)} \cdots & p_{1n(2)} \\ p_{21(t)} & p_{22(t)} \cdots & p_{2n(t)} \\ & \vdots & \\ p_{n1(t)} & p_{n2(t)} \cdots & p_{nn(t)} \end{vmatrix} \qquad (3)$$

The matrix p(t) is called a transition matrix and its elements accordingly are called transition probabilities.

All of this amounts to nothing more than a probablistic bookkeeping system until some structure of simplifying assumptions is imposed upon it. The Russian mathematician, A. A. Markov, suggested a set of two such assumptions or axioms that led to a mathematical tool that is extremely important both in theory and in application. This is the so-called Markov chain model.[7] The two Markovian assumptions establish the structure of his model and distinguish it from other stochastic, or time-driven probability processes. The first of these is Markov Axiom I:

> A stochastic process is a Markov process if and only if transition probabilities are statistically independent.

This could be called an axiom of historical irrelevance. It says in effect that the location of an element at time t depends solely on its location at time t-1, and in no sense on the way in which it arrived at that state. It is easy to misinterpret this axiom. It does not say that the probabilities associated with two distinct paths both of which originate in location i and which terminate eventually in location j are necessarily equal. It says only that once two elements arrive at the same position they have identical probabilities of going to any other particular position, regardless of the divergent paths taken to their common location.

The second Markovian condition is Markov Axiom II:

> Transition probabilities are invariant in time.

This can be restated in matrix algebraic terms to say that for a

Markov chain and for any time, t, there exists a matrix, P, such that $P(t)=P$. These two assumptions of the Markov chain may or may not be patently unrealistic in the context of institutional dynamics. Before this important problem is considered it would be well to recognize that the Markov chain, as characterized by its axioms, has some intriguing and perhaps usefull mathematical properties. One result is this:

$$p_{i(t)} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} p_{j(t-1)} \; p_{ij(t)}, \qquad (4)$$

which, by the definition of a matrix product, can be re-expressed in terms of a vector and a transition matrix as follows:

$$\alpha(t) = \alpha(t-1)\, P(t). \qquad (5)$$

Now this may not create a roar of excitement at first glance. In fact, (5) when applied recursively, tells us that the structure of the system at time t depends only on the structure of the system at time 0 and on the governing transition matrices. That is,

$$\alpha(t) = \alpha(0)\, P(1)\, P(2) \ldots P(t). \qquad (6)$$

The second or chain axiom simplifies (6) remarkably. Since the transition matrices are constant under this axiom, the preceding result reduces to:

$$\alpha(t) = \alpha(0)\, P^t, \qquad (7)$$

where P^t is the transition matrix, P, raised to the t^{th} power. This remarkable theorem shows that the entire Markov chain depends on two simple entities, the initial distribution vector and the constant transition matrix. With the knowledge of these entities one can reconstruct the history of the system and, indeed, can predict its behavior at any future point in time. Needless to say, this intriguing condition is true in fact only to the extent that the two axioms accurately characterize the real world system under investigation as it operates through time.

The property of (7) has led mathematicians to examine the long-run behavior of P^t. An important result has been found for one class of Markov chain, called the regular class. A chain is regular if it is possible, after a sufficient number of steps, to move from any state to any other state. This is the class in which we should be primarily interested if it is agreed that any institution, over a sufficiently long run of time can either improve itself or go downhill. The regular Markov chain has a property that higher powers of the transition matrix, P^t, as t gets very big, comes closer and closer to and eventually becomes identical with a limiting matrix, called A. The strange and important feature of the matrix A is that each of its rows is identical to every other one. To put all of this a bit more formally, we have:

$$\lim_{t} P^t = A = [a_{ij}], \text{ subject to} \qquad a_{ij} = a_{kj}, \; i, \; k = 1, 2, \ldots, n. \tag{8}$$

Certainly (8) does not appear to be a dramatic assertion, but in fact it is. The result of it is that any regular Markov chain system moves to an equilibrium state and, moreover, it turns out that the equilibrium state has absolutely nothing to do with the state of origin. The theorem says that in the limit of P^t, each row is the same as every other row. Thus, for any column j, the probability of reaching j is the same for any starting position, i. In such a system then history forgets its origins and arrives inexorably at an equilibrium distribution.

Now let us return slowly to earth, but without forgetting altogether the heights of mathematical abstraction that have been visited. In fact, it would be wise to consider what is mathematically a restatement of (8) on the way down. A fundamental theorem of Markov chain theory tells us the following:

> A regular Markov chain with any initial vector, $\alpha(0)$, has a limiting vector that depends only on the transition matrix, p. (9)

The word "any" in (9) is almost more emotional than mathematical. It is an optimistic statement. It says, in effect, that we can begin with a set of institutions that are even uniformly bad, yet this worst of all possible starts does not necessarily damn the system to ultimate mediocrity. The final (equilibrium) quality distribution of academic institutions depends not at all on where it started, but instead on the transitional structure of the system, on its openness as represented in the transition matrix P.

Do not lose sight of the fact that we are in a wonderland, a world that is entirely dominated by two possibly unrealistic axioms.

Still, the system that these axioms generate is a hopeful one, one that might be consciously emulated as an act of policy. The hope for such a system rests in the fact that the transitional structure rather than the distributional structure of any time point dictates its ultimate outcome. In this light look once again at (3), disregarding the time subscripting in accord with axiom II. The matrix P can be cut up into three basic sections by drawing two parallel lines on either side of the major diagonal. The values within the lines, that is along the major diagonal, are large in a static unchanging system and are small in one that is subject to high mobility. The triangle of values above the diagonal are relatively large in a system that is improving, in one that is carrying the bulk of its elements into a higher subclass than that in which they began. If the entries of P below the major diagonal predominate, then the system is in the state of deterioration.

All of this mathematics may seem remote, but in a last analysis it only bolsters common sense. The theorems say only that a system that sends its institutions upward will improve; that one which forces its elements down will degrade; that one which prevents change will stagnate. What has not been shown here, and what cannot be displayed because of technical requirements, is the fact that this mathematical model yields much more information about the system than has been suggested to this point. If a system's governing transition matrix is known then such facts also can be discovered as the average length of time that an element will remain in a given class, the likelihood of returning to a class having once left it, and the length of time likely to be taken in making the return. From a sheerly mathematical point of view, this is a rich information system. The question remains whether it is even remotely useful as a model of reality in the dynamics of academic institutions.

These remarks are intended to suggest that probability theory and particularly the Markovian model can provide a valuable tool for analyzing the dynamics of academic quality. Before this suggestion can be entertained seriously several questions must be raised. First, we must consider Markov chain theory as a model of social reality. Then we must ask whether it is a presently practical, that is an accurately descriptive, model. To move further afield, or perhaps into the heart of the matter, we must determine whether it is a useful _policy_ model.

Intuitively, if on no other grounds, one certainly must reject the Markov chain model as an adequate representation of present reality. Suppose that two institutions arrive simultaneously at a middle quality status, one by struggling up to it the other by descending to it. The first Markov axiom demands that these two institutions be governed identically by the laws of probability: that each suffer an equal probability of relative success or failure in the future. This demand simply fails to square with one's intuitive understanding of institutional dynamics.

The second axiom requires that external factors remain external; that nothing such as federal policy, philanthropy, or the volume of academic manpower be allowed to intervene in such a way as to change the risks of institutional success or failure. In the contemporary American scene this is ludicrous. By any reasonable assessment the Markov chain model does not provide an especially good representation of reality in the case of changing academic institutions.

It does not follow necessarily that this analytic framework should be abandoned forthwith. In fact, there is every reason to suggest that it should be entertained seriously. It is simple, yet it has a rich variety of properties; and its axiomatic constraints can be tested against the facts. To abandon it would require a remove either into a more simple-minded probability model, toward a more demanding mathematical structure, or away from quantitative analysis altogether. None of these is a particularly inviting option.

There are, in fact, mathematical techniques available to test the extent to which an empirical system deviates from the requirements of Markov theory. There are also techniques available for enriching the theory so as to reflect reality more closely, yet without destroying its predictive value. Hence, despite the limitations imposed by the Markovian simplifying assumptions, this seems to be a reasonable tool with which to begin.

Consider next this stochastic model as a tool for policy making. Here the picture seems to be quite different. In fact, Markov theory may provide an excellent information system for policy makers. It focuses attention immediately on the critical problem of openness, of the necessary and sufficient characteristics of channels for institutional improvement. This mathematical system can provide policy makers with information about minimal and optimal levels of intervention necessary to improve academic quality to any stipulated extent at any specified time.

Moreover, this same mathematical model can serve as an evaluative device for assessing the effectiveness of an intervention program. If such a program is really effective, then it should have the result of violating the second Markov axiom. That is, the institutional quality transition matrix should not remain constant through time. Mathematical tools are available for deciding whether fluctuations in observed transition matricies are random departures from a stationary governing matrix or whether they reflect the results of systematic change. All of this suggests a rather novel form of field experimentation in institutional intervention programs. Before and after measures could be taken, but the important measures, rather than simply those of quality, would more importantly be those of change in quality over the time intervals immediately preceding and following the experimental intervention.

I believe that data are available with which to conduct research of the sort that has been sketched out in this paper. A battery of quality measures is available with which to evaluate participating institutions. Many of these measures are available for at least three different points in time. Thus, the first major problem, that of measurement of institutional quality, can be attacked immediately with tools that are at hand. This accomplished, the second major problem, that of measuring patterns of change in institutional quality, can be attacked with the newer tools that have been described here.

Many possibly useful quality measures, such as library volumes, institutional expenditures, and similar measures are available at several time points. These data contain a number of serious problems, but hopefully not of sufficient magnitude to render them useless. They should be used at once in the traditional measurement process. An adequate measure of institutional quality achieved, the next traditional steps should be taken. Tests should be conducted to determine whether or not systematic differences in measured institutions, such as in participation or non-participation in a cooperating program, lead to systematic differences in measured quality. These steps completed, the way would be open for a dynamic analysis of institutional quality using the Markovian model, among others. Certainly none of these efforts would produce a panacea, an information revolution, nor even guidelines for major breakthroughs. At the very least, however, they should provide new information and, perhaps in addition, a major new light on old information.

NOTES

1. For a detailed discussion of Measurement Theory, see W. S. Torgerson (7) or P. Suppes and J. L. Zinnes (6).
2. For a recent discussion of Quality Assessment in Graduate Education, see Allan M. Cartter (1).
3. For a general discussion of the Adequacy of Tests and Measurements, see J. Nunnally (5).
4. Allan M. Cartter op. cit.
5. Ph. D. dissertation in preparation by Miss Mary Ann Millsap (4).
6. For an introduction to the probability concepts that are used here, see J. G. Kemeney, et. al. (2), Chapters 3, 6, 7.
7. For a discussion of Markov Chains, see J. G. Kemeney, et. al. (3).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Cartter, Allan M. "An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education." Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1966.

2. Kemeney, John G., H. Mirkil, J. L. Snell, G. L. Thompson. Finite Mathematical Structures. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1959.

3. Kemeney, John G. and J. L. Snell. Finite Markov Chains. Princeton, N. J.: D. VanNostrand, 1960.

4. Millsap, Mary Ann. "Educational Training and Spatial Mobility of Social Scientists: A Cohort Analysis." A Ph. D. dissertation (in preparation), Cornell University, June 1967.

5. Nunnally, J. Tests and Measurements. New York: McGraw Hill, 1959.

6. Suppes, P. and J. L. Zinnes. "Basic Measurement Theory," Chapter 1, Handbook of Mathematical Psychology, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1963.

7. Torgerson, Warren S. Theory and Methods of Scaling. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.

ON LEADERSHIP FOR DEVELOPING COLLEGES

Lawrence C. Howard
Director, Institute of Human Relations
The University of Wisconsin

Change for developing colleges is a process heavily dependent upon forces external to the campus and often outside higher education. In contrast, research, graduate education, and the academic guilds set the major perameters of change for established universities.[1] Because of its greater environmental dependency a central device for effecting change in the developing colleges is to alter external relationships. The strategy for change involves adjusting the college's effective environment to its inherent potentialities.

While the social ecology of the developing college is its immediate community, state, and region, it is also part of the world of higher education. This dual overview is essential for an understanding of the process of educational development. A partnership between the developing colleges and the United States Office of Education should be formed to discover strategies of change rooted in local environmental pressures and national educational trends. The development of such a partnership would provide leadership of critical importance to higher education as a whole.

Title III of the Higher Education Act, the Developing Colleges

Program, is a natural vehicle for promoting this partnership. The Title authorizes the United States Office of Education to expand the nation's resource in quality higher education, through assisting the developing colleges with funds for fellowships and support for interinstitutional cooperation with America's leading colleges and universities. In 1967-68, $30 million is available.

Despite apparent opportunities, problems abound. It has proven difficult to identify the developing. Title III language characterizes them as colleges which "struggle for survival" and are "isolated from the main currents of higher education." In what appears as a contradiction, the Title also restricts aid to only those institutions which have the "desire and potential to make a substantial contribution to the higher education resources of our nation." Even after developing colleges are identified, sorting out their needs and achieving permanent improvement in academic quality will be difficult. A fellowship program offers little that is new, and possibilities for interinstitutional cooperation are only vague and open ended. The need for greater understanding looms. Where is influence to be exerted and toward what end?

There are no easy answers to the identity of the developing, their needs, and how Title III can be effective. And we offer no quick solutions, only suggestions for possibly arriving at better program guidelines. The hope implicit in the Higher Education Act is that the United States Office of Education and the developing institutions would begin to effectively interact with each other. The potentialities of this partnership have not received the attention they deserve, for greater interaction can produce some answers and, perhaps, open the door for the developing to make a larger contribution to higher education.

WHO ARE THE DEVELOPING

Our present needs are less for a measurement than for a procedure to begin to construct a yardstick. As a start, appropriate calibrations, quality-related institutional factors, need to be selected. A rather incredible quanity of data is available. The Office of Education regularly collects enrollment figures, faculty and professional data, program and curriculum information, statistics on library and other facilities, and detailed breakdowns of annual incomes and expenditures. There are numerous occasional studies which would also be useful. Several private agencies periodically publish other quality-related data by institution, on admissions criteria, percentages of academic dropouts, fellowship holders on campus, faculty academic achievement levels, and percentages of bachelor degree winners going on for graduate or professional education. Data far beyond this enumeration can be economically assembled for each institution for extended periods of time. To be sure, not all the necessary information is in hand, but enough is available to start to construct a usable measure of institutional quality.

Once selected, data must next be organized along quality continuums. It is generally agreed that growth in library holdings, expenditures per student, percentages of Ph. D. 's, or rising numbers of graduates admitted to prestigious professional schools are factors associated with advancing quality levels. Steady gains registered over a period of years strongly suggest a quality advance. We would have in the United States Office of Education perhaps as many as 200 quality laden factors to utilize.

But the problem is much more complex; mere expansion in quantitative terms (books, Ph. D. 's, students, majors, graduate departments) may not unerringly mean corresponding gains in quality. Unites to be calibrated may be of different sizes along the ruler. Rather than being linear, quantitative growth patterns which correspond to quality gains may be "S" shaped and resemble learning curves. Moreover, marginal utility notions and alternative use criteria would even further refine our judgments. We need to identify the conditions under which quantity and quality have a direct or an inverse relationship. As Seymour Harris has pointed out, "The price tag on a unit of education is less than the average cost of providing it . . . for education, permanently increased enrollment may very often mean larger total losses."[2]

Selecting the relevant factors and giving them appropriate weights can be approached through several devices. Panels of experts were used by Allen Cartter in his recent study of graduate education.[3] An analysis of the institutional characteristics common to a group of colleges already known for their high quality could provide criteria. An internal consistency analysis of the universe of higher education reviewed for a period of time would permit a rough ranking and would point up apparent strengths and deficiencies.

When the relevant quality continuums have been identified, multidimensional analysis can be applied to arrive at an empirical approximation of their clustering tendencies and the relative weights to be assigned individual factors. This procedure is hazardous and expensive, but the selection and weighing of institutional factors is an achievable goal. The resulting measures, moreover, can be improved through comparative analysis and case studies.

More difficult will be to discover how these multiple factors or vectors are related to each other. This step can be taken only after experimentation. Many adjustments will be needed to accommodate the complexities of higher education, controls, sizes, types, clienteles, programs. Defensible combinations of factors with significant levels of correlation to our quality criteria will have to be developed. But measureable units can be established. The yardstick should be constructed and offered for public discussion. The units are already widely in use, but should be more carefully calibrated.

The next step will be to establish a time dimension. The idea of developing implies movement. A collection of institutional factors for a number of years will provide insights and patterns which are not apparent in viewing data for a single year. Our conception of a developing institution will begin to crystallize as we chart patterns of change for individual colleges in relation to like institutions and the field of higher education.

Our attention should be primarily directed toward discovering what a given institution can become. We need a procedure for looking into the future to ascertain, with a high degree of probability, what the quality-laden institutional factors are tending toward. Our assemblage of time data and its partition into a fine mesh may make possible some computations of change rates in individual factors and among clusters of factors all of which may be themselves changing in their rates of change. Some moving combinations may be associated with higher, others with diminished quality levels. As our vision shifts from individual factors to the system of factors, we can conceptualize a given institution as a series of vectors in a matrix. Each cell would represent both a given quality-factor quantity and a probability factor instrinsic in the interrelationship and its tendency to move over time to new qualitative levels or to an equilibrium.

Robert McGinnis of Cornell University and A. T. Bharucha-Reid of Wayne State University have suggested that a quantitative analysis of changes in institutional quality could be made through constructing a number of these matrices and utilizing stochastic process theory.[4] A. A. Markov, a Russian mathematician, invented such a procedure for measuring change possibilities in systems in which the individual components of the field are themselves changing in their respective rates of change. Two assumptions govern Markovian chains; first, that a given factor in the system has a probability for movement based on its own evolutionary dynamic and its evolving interrelationships with all other relevant evolving factors in the system. The second assumption states that these change probabilities remain constant over time. Thus, when we compute these probabilities in the system, we can project its probable position in the future.

If these mathematical models are reasonably accurate reflections of the actualities in the world of higher education, then projections could be made as to the direction, speed of transformation, and ultimate equilibrium for each college in quality terms. Note that these eventual states are the results of combinations and thus current quality levels may mask major potential. It is quite possible that in the institutional data on now fairly unattractive colleges there are change combinations far more promising than those the better known institutions may reveal. The relevance of such a procedure for sorting out the developing from the deteriorating and stagnant is exhilarating to contemplate.

Needless to say, bringing off such a projection will be extremely difficult and should be viewed as a developmental process. A strength, as well as a weakness, of the Markovian model is its assumption that these change probabilities remain constant over time. Since this probability bears only a limited resemblance to the real world, it demands that rates of change be constantly reexamined and the model adjusted to refine its predictive potential. It is also not to suggest that the "Grand Design" can be immediately unlocked, but rather that our knowledge of the change process can be vastly improved. Let me underline that this part of the process of identifying the developing can be carried out only by the Office of Education which, with a $1.4 billion budget, has come center stage in American education. The United States Office of Education alone has the necessary accumulation of data.

But as this dynamic ensemble is pondered, it becomes increasingly apparent that understanding educational change must be a partnership undertaking. Each college moves in a supportive environment which stretches well beyond its campus.

THE NEEDS OF THE DEVELOPING

Information at the Office of Education and indeed current research on higher education provide only a blurred insight into the needs of the developing. The chance to correct this inherent myopia is the opportunity presented by the Higher Education Act. Title III funds stimulate the developing to clarify who they are and to assess their needs. The foundation is thus laid for a partnership.

The developing can hold up their end of the partnership only if they are willing to look critically at themselves. It may be that there is a parallel phenomenon to the developing institution in a developing student, developing faculty, and developing administration--in a developing region. At least the authors of Title III thought so as they reported many graduates of these colleges as having academic achievement inferior to that of many high school graduates elsewhere.

A beginning in self identity must include an assessment of the college's inputs and outputs in its milieu. On this M. M. Chambers has written:

> There is seldom if ever to be found any reasonably comprehensive traverse of the social, economic, and geopolitical characteristics of the district or region principally served by the colleges, projected in depth and developed with cognizance of past changes, current trends, and probable future tendencies.[5]

Note, this is not just another call for institutional research or long range planning; rather, it is the necessity to see the college as an interacting element in its supportive environment.

The needs of the developing are probably to be found in part through procedures quite comparable to those suggested for the Office of Education as identity criteria. The developing college also needs to resist the reductionism of looking only at its present shortcomings and instead should be encouraged to look to the next higher system of organization upon which the college is dependent. This effective environment provides the matrix which governs the evolutionary changes and reveals the interrelationships. The fruitful search for needs will take the developing college's leadership off the campus and into the environment.

It may start with a look at governing boards, but it will go on to master plans, accrediting agencies, appropriations, cohorts of available students, and beyond to historical, economic, and cultural considerations.[6]

In preparing guidelines for its consultants, the Commission on Undergraduate Education in the Biological Sciences has summarized this point:

> Campuses differ. The most obvious differences rest with the stated mission of the institution, its relationship to the community it serves, the professional commitment and the social composition of its faculty. Each institution has its own institutionalized 'system of values' which reflect those of the trustees, the president, the dean, the department heads and the faculty. This value system is a result of the complex of commitments that have evolved as the institution has adapted to the internal and external forces which constitute the social ecology of the institution.[7]

We must also look beyond the immediate region. Higher education in the United States increasingly is one system in which there are identifiable forces, education districts, diverging tax efforts, and other critical determinants. Nor should it be assumed that the private colleges are separated from this grid; not only are their restraints similarly structured, but public and private facilities are intimately related in the over-all educational effort.

The leader of the developing college will not understand the needs of his institution until he has taken into account these impinging forces that establish legitimacy and determine current postures. In the process, the lurking shibboleth that development's major obstacle is autocratic college based leadership may be reexamined.

Again, this is not a search for a power structure, although real restraints will be identified by the developing; rather, it is to suggest that the setting in which the college finds itself must be included in the equation in order that its dynamics can be utilized. We must develop the capacity to weigh a college's effectiveness in terms of the super-systems of which it is a part, and there are positive as well as negative factors to be taken into account. A macrodimensional view must be added to the micro assessments that have generally prevailed.

Katz and Kahn have provided the theoretical model for this approach:

> The basic hypothesis is that organization and other social systems are open systems which attain stability through their authority structures, reward mechanisms, and value systems, and which are changed primarily from without by means of some significant change in inputs.[8]

If systems resist inputs indefinitely, they may eventually perish. Without knowledge of these needs in their setting, the Title III program may involve applying the right solutions to the wrong problems.

Better knowledge of why the developing are as they are will be an important stimulus to restructure college environments to open new opportunities. In all of this the Higher Education Act is a natural tool, particularly through the charge to promote interinstitutional cooperation.

A RELEVANT TITLE III

This set of problems and opportunities is the raison d'etre of Title III. The Higher Education Act, as Frank Bowles has pointed out, calls for an "educational revolution whose immediate purpose is to educate every child as far as individual ability will permit."[9] The Act is dual purposed, to strengthen the nation's educational system, and to use it as an effective instrument for social change. It should be clearly understood that this is a beginning toward making higher education not just available but an achievable reality for all.

A relevant Title III could emerge from this projected partnership between the Office of Education and the developing. Clearly one tributary to the main currents, heretofore closed to the developing, is the opportunity to shape the character of federal support for higher education. In overseeing the cooperative programs, a new and steadily expanding knowledge of the potentialities in the developing colleges and the constraints they face should produce multiple opportunities for creative action. The Office of Education could review the many research, development, and demonstration funds it oversees, toward more precisely grouping resources in the magnitude required. It can be amply justified that these colleges are excellent investments. Increased familiarity with the personnel and programs in the back waters of education will not fail to uncover untapped talent and underutilized resources. The authors of Title III foresaw this possibility.

As it becomes clearer to the Office of Education and to developing colleges that Title III is not a poverty program but a cooperative commitment to more and better education for all, better guidelines will emerge. These guidelines are likely to indicate the following direction:

Cooperative efforts should be integral not incidental to the developing colleges' major purposes and clientele. Primary attention should be given to the developing student, with his inadequate high school preparation on the one hand and the potential enrichment he offers on the other. Cross racial and class integration promises not only intrinsic educational benefits but is necessary to orderly social revolution.

A geographic factor is unavoidable. Greater resources must be channeled to places where stark needs exist. The Higher Education Act projects the idea that education should be available for all--even for those who can't afford it, those inadequately prepared, or those historically denied equal access.

Transitional programs and enriched lower division arts and science offerings may have to take precedence over specialized and professional offerings. All proposals should be screened to assure that they go to the heart of the educational process at the developing institution.

Cooperation should reflect genuine and pervasive interaction and should not be mere injections. The objective is much more than a filling in; it is to utilize the relationship to move outsiders into the ranks of established higher education. The new relationship must be creatively carried out to make clear that the contribution the developing brings is needed.

Cooperation is a substantive process, not a project. Genuine interinstitutional cooperation involves common planning and sharing toward a mutually rewarding interdependence. In the final analysis we must come to recognize that all of higher education is one. Needless to say, the Office of Education must press research on interinstitutional cooperation in order to promote our inadequate understanding of this generally endorsed mechanism.

Cooperation should be initiative not imitative. A rational sequence of successive steps should enable the developing to do more in the setting in which they have to operate. The direction of a viable program would be toward the innovative and experimental in curricula, in calendars, and in the use of the community as a resource for learning. Nowhere is it clearer that current methods in teaching are inadequate and inappropriate. Nowhere will there be greater reward for supporting the new techniques of transmitting knowledge: educational television, language laboratories, films, computer learning systems, independent study, and student participation in teaching. The Developing Colleges Program provides a unique opportunity to aid the introduction and utilization of these innovations. It offers the promise of shorter time lags before these techniques become available to populations most in need of them.

Leadership is indispensable in accepting the Higher Education Act's creative opportunities. The Developing Colleges Program, rightly understood, is a wedge toward needed change and a laboratory in which to perfect the tool. It aims to enhance all of higher education. Almost for the first time support is offered uncircumscribed by state allocations or narrow program goals. Because it seeks to improve the whole of the higher education system, it avoids the imbalances inherent in aiding only elite schools, because it calls the colleges to be full partners, it sets aside fears of federal control. This is, in short, a chance for unparalled growth in educational quality. The leaders will be those who are responsive to these larger possibilities.

NOTES

1. Wolk, Ronald A., "Forces and Direction," Current Issues in Higher Education, Association for Higher Education, Pressures and Priorities in Higher Education, (Washington, D.C. 1965), p. 2.

2. Harris, Seymour E., Challenge and Change in American Higher Education, (McKutchan Publishing Corp., Berkeley, Calif. 1965), p. 231.

3. Cartter, Allen, An Assessment of Quality Graduate Education, American Council on Education, (Washington, D.C. 1966).

4. McGinnis, Robert, "Analyzing the Dynamics of Academic Quality," background paper for Conference on Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education, 1967.

5. Campus and the People, Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., (Danville, Ill. 1960), p. 30.

6. Bolman, Frederick W., "Needed Research on Administration of Higher Education," The Educational Record, Vol. 46, No. 2, (Spring 1965), pp. 166-176.

7. Commission on Undergraduate Education in the Biological Sciences, "Draft of a Statement on the CUEBS Consultant Bureau."

8. Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., (New York 1966), p. 448-9.

9. "The Dual Purpose Revolution," Current Issues in Higher Education, Association of Higher Education, (Washington, D.C. 1966), p. 17.

PERSPECTIVES ON THE NATURE OF INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

There is general agreement about the effectiveness of interinstitutional cooperation--programs between developing and established schools can work provided there is a genuine mutual exchange. Moreover, the cooperative idea is not limited to advanced and developing schools but promises to become a trend in higher education. As forerunners of this trend, these first Title III projects are more significant than their limited scope would suggest.

In tracing the development of the cooperative process, Dr. Lawrence Howard notes that the burgeoning exchange programs must be placed in a theoretical framework. Not until we fully understand the process involved in these relationships can we direct education toward its "main frontier--to invent new roles for old institutions."

Using a systems theory, Daniel Katz defines the university as "an open, loosely articulated system which at times has ill-defined boundaries and moves toward randomness and away from a unified, coordinated structure." Although this disjointed framework creates many problems within the universities, it also provides an agreeable climate for cooperative programs.

Robert McGinnis shows how statistical analysis can be used in determining academic quality. Using a branch of mathematics called "stochastic process theory," he illustrates how patterns of change in educational quality can be measured.

In his paper on leadership for developing colleges, Dr. Howard calls the Higher Education Act a natural tool for gaining increased knowledge of the needs, the effective environment, and the dynamics of the developing schools. With Title III aid, this new knowledge can be channeled into creative programs that will strengthen higher education and stimulate social change.

Discussion following these papers centered on the structural nature of the two groups of schools and the implications for interinstitutional cooperation. What is the relevance of the loosely structured fabric of the university? What inputs will invigorate and strengthen the developing colleges? Some of these insights, exchanges, and differences are included below:

THE UNIVERSITY VIEWED AS AN OPEN SYSTEM:

University Loosely Structured

> The university is open because other systems cut across it. If it's a state university, it's part of the political system of the state. Faculty members have a limited commitment to any particular university and tend to be more firmly attached to their respective disciplines. The research at the university is often indistinguishable from that of industry or private organizations. Secondly, the university consists of many poorly coordinated parts, each with a great deal of autonomy. The function of freedom of inquiry and discovery has led to decisions being made at various levels in the structure even though the formal organization of the university doesn't call for decisions to be made low in the hierarchy. The university's formal

system should be brought more in line with its informal functioning to create greater responsibility in the decisions.

Implications for Cooperation

The openness of the university as a system makes possible a variety of cooperative arrangements. There aren't the built-in barriers. Staff members don't have that symbolic commitment to a given place and are able to cooperate with other institutions.

Feedback Problems

Two characteristics of a university, viewed as a social system, are its energic feedback and information feedback systems. Energic feedback refers to the energy available for continuing the activity. It can be delayed and remote, as in research activity, or it can be more immediate, as in teaching. When gratification becomes extremely remote, special problems are created. Since such gratification lags are likely in inter-university cooperation, this problem must be given attention. The second problem is information feedback. Research by the university on its own activities, operational research, and long range planning is very weak. Few business organizations would try to operate as universities do without much more adequate feedback.

Energic Feedback in Operation

Here is a specific example of a cooperative arrangement which demonstrates this energic feedback. This exchange between Tuskegee Institute and the University of Michigan has been in operation for several years.

Tuskegee has the problem of retaining its staff, of attracting good young people, and of motivating students. We at the University of Michigan needed Negro graduate students and research facilities in the South. As a result of these identified needs, our staffs met and planned a cooperative research institute at Tuskegee to be manned by additions to the Tuskegee staff. We invested training funds on some faculty from Tuskegee to give them additional training in research. We plan to follow this up with additional staff and to send some of our graduate students down for training in this institute, thus making the relationship even more reciprocal. This example illustrates a two-way arrangement with an energic feedback.

Openness Challenged

The university system as a whole is in several respects closed. First, there are access problems: it's hard to get in as a student and it's hard to get in as a teacher. Once in as student or teacher, it's hard to get out . . . Another reality is that the university is an absolutely segregated system between students and teachers with only a tiny trickle of knowledge going from one group to the other. The distinction between management and labor is much more vague. There are all kinds of ranks in labor, whereas the student-teacher gap is an absolute line . . . Assuming the actual closed nature of the institutions, we arrive at a limited possibility for inter-institutional cooperation, such as the type of research institute described.

Research Develops Openness

The way to develop this openness is for Tuskegee to get this research institute under way and do research on the latest problems. It can then become a resource for government and industry in that area; a center for applied research is a way to get some added inputs.

Is Program Reciprocal

The one-way exchange of the Tuskegee research institute seems far more patronizing than an arrangement under which Tuskegee would denude itself of its few very good teachers to go to the University of Michigan. In the program described, the only thing the developing institution offers is its students as experimental models for the University of Michigan people to study.

Social Involvement Stressed

The University of Michigan has a mere handful of Negro students and even fewer Negroes on the faculty. Therefore, the school is out of intimate contact with the Civil Rights movement and this segment of American society. It was believed that this relationship with Tuskegee could sharpen the university's sensitivity and give a feeling of greater knowledge and involvement.

Dangers Involved

If the established institution reaches down to help, the aided institution is in danger of losing its identity and may be prevented from becoming the kind of school it ought to be. There are great dangers here for both institutions: the established school might feel very noble and want the developing institution to be accredited; the developing school might be glad of the accreditation; in the process both may have left the main work undone.

Political Issue Raised

It's a mistake to consider that conditions in the established institutions are uniformly high and completely transferrable to the developing institutions. That raises a fundamental question about your systems presentation. You've indicated a preference for the college with an open system, but the developing school may be situated in a hostile environment. A college can often be in a politically disadvantaged position, yet you say it is not a good idea for the university to be involved in politics.

Avoid Commitment

We want to push toward openness, but we can't make the university co-equal with all activities in society. The university has a distinctive function. If the college actively and directly intervened in the political process, you'd have what's happened at California . . . There are occasions, emergency situations, calling for direct action. But by and large, the college is not a political movement. The student protest movement, for example, doesn't represent the university. The university should not be committed even if it is a very strong protest movement. On the other hand, this movement can have positive effects within the university leading to changes in the environment. This has happened on campuses where students have changed the practices of discrimination and made the environment more congenial. But it is quite another thing to have the university enter directly into the political processes.

RELEVANT INPUTS FOR DEVELOPING COLLEGES:

Study Resource Outlay

How do we make it possible for an institution to do more with what it has? Whatever the input, the objective is for the institution to be able to sustain this gain. We should give some attention to how the current resources of the developing institution might be better allocated.

Possibilities of TV

The use of television, either closed circuit or microwave relay systems, has been proposed for developing colleges. Whether the notion of trying to get academic stars to perform on television and be presented to classrooms in developing institutions would lead to an even greater sense of non-participation or undermine professional identity is a separate question. People who have been professors in these institutions could suddenly become section hands because of the new media.

Video Course Outlined

We have tried to meet this problem by bringing together faculty from the developing institutions and a distinguished lecturer such as David Riesman or Daniel Bell. The institutional representatives and the great teacher jointly plan the video course. We are trying to find a formula where the psychology of interaction might be built in. This is one way that may take us over some of the barriers to the use of television in the South.

TV Supplements Course

Oberlin has a good Chinese language department, and we don't have any. But we do have a video tape set-up. A teacher from Oberlin video-recorded his instructions on Chinese pronunciation. Then we engaged a graduate student from Taiwan as a full time instructor on our campus. After our students have gone through three quarters of this course, they can transfer to Oberlin for a year.

Promote Lecture Series

Several of the engineering societies have a distinguished lecture series in which the professional organization sends out excellent speakers to institutions with student chapters. Perhaps the foundations or the government could finance other programs of this nature, geared to the needs of the developing institutions.

Bridge Isolation Barrier

I think our conversation really skirts the problem of isolation facing these developing institutions. They are not informationally isolated that much. There has been little student exchange under Title III, yet this is reasonably economical and can be done with relatively large numbers of people. The impact could be very substantial in surmounting the isolation barrier.

Racial Isolation Prevalent

For example, I recall three young ladies from Tuskegee commenting that this was the first time they had studied under a teacher who was not a Negro. You realize the isolation--they grow up, study under Negro teachers, go on to a Negro college, and associate with Negro students and Negro instructors.

Probe Resources and Rules

A system is an abstraction. It is defined by two things; the resources that go into it and the rules by which these resources are allocated. This suggests that there are two places in which to probe in order to change the system--resources or the rules. This in turn leads to the question of who makes the rules and who makes the rules about how you make the rules. That is the super-system.

Locate Access Points

In trying to bring about a change in organizations, should you focus upon what is called the primary power of focus? In the case of the Negro college, it's often said that the president is the key. Should you work on him, or on the faculty and the students to create a kind of dissonance, a desire to change things? Where are the points of access from the systems' point of view which are likely to produce change? I think it is the presidents, but I think you move in on them only if you have real new inputs in the way of resources.

Study Environmental Factors

We should also keep in mind that these institutions exist in an environment which also sets definite perimeters on what changes are possible. A developing college is directly related to a number of public school systems, to an economic-industrial setting, to a political system. It may be that access to one of these environmental factors is another direct way to achieve change in a developing institution. Certainly the accrediting associations are important in this respect.

Problems in Planning

Let me address myself to the problem of compulsory planning at the state level--that is, to coordinating agencies. Political leaders, needing a sounder basis for judgments regarding the use of state funds for higher education, have set up agencies at the state level to advise the legislatures and governors. As a first step, these agencies have generally developed master plans for higher education over a substantial period of time. The problem is how to define just what the agency should do and what it should not do. If this could be clarified, the necessary public acceptance of the idea of a system of higher education for the state would come. But at stake are the futures of the individual institutions which must be the instrumentalities for carrying out the long-range plans.

Solution Proposed

Perhaps the solution to this problem lies in making a distinction between political and educational issues in the state. Unfortunately, many educators are unwilling to recognize that bona fide political issues exist relative to higher education. Despite the fact that presidents of state universities have to go through the state political structure to get funds, they still wish to retain the right to make all the decisions . . . an agency charged with coordinating higher education at the state level should crystallize the alternatives, with much help from the educational institutions themselves. Coordinating agencies in turn will have to recognize the need for a high degree of collaboration in the formulation of these plans.

Pitfalls to Avoid

> Educational commissions may reach a point where their work becomes so routine that they fail to take account of the innovations that are needed. They get to the point where they finance the status quo instead of innovating. It's easy for any public body to accumulate power; herein lies a considerable danger from these coordinating committees. They want to avoid duplications and unnecessary expenditures of money. You can see the implications of the power unit dipping into the institution and trying to tell it what the details of its program shall be. A second problem is what needs to be standardized through this collaborating agency and what does not. It's obvious that such things as the definition of a full-time student should be standardized. On the other hand, if this means standardization of syllabi or appointments for professors through some kind of civil service structure, then it is unwise.

From the foregoing discussion, it is obvious that interinstitutional cooperation is not a simple matter of setting up exchange programs between schools but hinges on the nature of the institutions involved. The loosely structured university with its many autonomous parts has a built-in openness for this cooperation. But there must be an energic feedback for the established institution. Exchange must be reciprocal, with advanced institutions sharing the immediate gains or satisfaction.

The needs and dynamics of the developing school must be studied with a view to determining what inputs will produce sustained gains. Analysis must also be made of the setting in which the school operates, including socio-economic factors and political pressures.

Much more information is needed on both developing and established institutions before a theoretical framework can be formulated. Colleges participating in Title III exchanges and the U. S. Office of Education might form a partnership to produce this new knowledge which could, in turn, improve the Title III programs and ultimately all higher education.

III SOME IMPLICATIONS OF INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION FOR THE GOVERNANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION RELATED TO THE MANAGEMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Today, interinstitutional cooperation is an accomplished and accepted fact of educational life. Hundreds of cooperative programs have been executed in the past, thousands are in process now, and many more are likely in the increasingly complex world of higher education. It is important that we consider the administrative aspects of these undertakings, especially of those involving established and developing institutions.

Algo D. Henderson observes that attitudes toward higher education have changed since World War II. Pre-war emphasis focused on the benefits for the individual student; today we are also aware of the benefits that society gains from its educated members. Thus, the colleges must consider the public interest in planning curricula and research.

Since the educational task is now so much larger, interdependence becomes an unavoidable necessity. Systems of higher education have emerged in geographic areas, as devices to reduce costs, and as a means to upgrade the quality in a group of institutions by more specialization among individual members. These forces have meant that cooperative attitudes in higher education now have superceded the competitive ones. Individual colleges must not only keep better records on themselves, but they must share data with others, along with increased cooperation via the electronic media.

The styles of administration have also changed. This is especially true of ventures between institutions in which one is senior and the other junior. Psychological obstacles loom up, including defensiveness and overprotectiveness, which reflect poorly identified missions. Self-studies are essential, not just to evolve a plan, but more fundamentally to prepare the colleges for the changes they must undergo.

We can expect, points out James Messersmith, a new breed of administrators who man these ever increasing cooperative ventures. With these administrative posts still in the evolutionary stage, administrators themselves must be versatile, with the capacity to adjust to the flexible nature of their positions. Much of their energy will have to go into developing mutual trust among the partners in the cooperative undertaking. Since progress depends ultimately on individuals, administrators must also motivate faculty members and staffs into participating in cooperative ventures. As these new administrators emphasize the inter in interinstitutional cooperation, they will need to have defined and redefined their role with respect to the individual campus: whether to move toward centralization or decentralization, program operation or inspirational inputs, advice or answers. The task is great and as yet too little experience has been accumulated.

The new media seem custom-made for interinstitutional sharing. In the background, points out Gary Gumpert, is the principle that there should be equal access to information, teaching talent, and educational resources. The more this principle gains acceptance, the more inevitable is interinstitutional cooperation. Most of the new hardware lends itself to cooperative patterns. Computer-assisted instruction and instructional television networks will become ever more common and available as multimedia approaches to communication improve. Obstacles are no longer in the technology but in resistance to these new devices and to cooperative efforts. There remains a fear of technology, the insistence on institutional isolation, and an inaccurate conception of academic freedom. Details about copyrights and compensation also must be ironed out.

The effort required to launch a cooperative program is outlined by C. M. Charles as he describes the events leading to cooperation between the Imperial Valley Campus of San Diego State College, la Universidad Autonoma de Baja California, and Centro de Ensenanza Tecnica Y Superior. Although separated by the United States-Mexico border, these three schools are developing colleges in an area that is traditionally anti-intellectual.

The "University of the Spirit" grew out of a desire to share limited resources, expand opportunities, and provide an enriching cross-cultural experience. The program succeeded for the Americans involved, but failed for the Mexicans. This disappointment stemmed from a mixture of language difficulties, border red-tape, decisions in remote Sacramento, and administrative changes. Yet, even though temporarily derailed, the movement to rebuild a relationship continues.

Raymond S. Moore presents a few highlights from the first national inventory of cooperative programs in higher education. The inventory, sponsored by the United States Office of Education, identified 1,000 consortia involving 1,800 colleges. One significant finding is that smaller schools are less likely to take part in cooperative undertakings, while a few major universities are involved in more than 50 cooperative ventures.

The poverty problem of developing schools must not be ignored says Fred E. Crossland. Sometimes the very programs intended to bolster the weaker schools raise expenditures to bankruptcy levels; no schools can afford that kind of assistance. The challenge for the stronger institutions is to help these schools become financially independent so that future cooperative undertakings will be genuinely reciprocal.

IMPLICATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATION ARISING FROM THE GROWING INTERDEPENDENCE OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Algo D. Henderson
Center for Research and Development in Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley

Cooperation, collaboration, or affiliation among colleges and universities are not new ideas as will be apparent from reflecting upon the history of Oxford and Cambridge, moves to affiliate professional schools with universities, and the responsibilities of our oldest planning-coordinating agency, the University of the State of New York. Today the cases number in the hundreds.

The interdependence among colleges and universities is growing rapidly. The movement toward forms of cooperation can be described by categorizing the various objectives to be achieved. They include:

First, to attain political objectives.

Examples: State planning-coordinating systems.
Interstate contracts for planning and coordination.

The aim is to determine at a high political level public policy relating to the nature, composition, availability, and support of higher education.

Second, to foster a creed or accomplish a mission.

Example: Colleges that are affiliated through a church.

The aim is to provide higher education as a service of a religious body and incorporate in the instruction and in the environment the religious and moral values of the church.

Third, to obtain economic support.

Example: Fund raising groups of colleges such as the several state foundations and the United Negro College Fund.

The aim is to attract a wider support for the group of member colleges than would be possible through the colleges working alone.

Fourth, to coordinate programs, exchange resources, and offer jointly supported services.

Examples: The Great Lakes Colleges Association.
The Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education.

The aim is to provide a unifying organization that will generate ideas for collaboration, assist in perfecting agreements among the institutions and take initiative in securing additional funds with which to carry out joint projects.

Fifth, to foster the development of new or less favored institutions.

Examples: The nursing of a new institution by an older one or assisting an institution to improve in quality or scope of services.

The aim is to enlarge the public services in higher education. Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 comes within this category. Its aim is to give assistance to developing colleges by arranging for the collaboration of well established ones.

In this paper I shall discuss the impacts on college administration arising from various of these types of association and discuss more specifically some administrative problems relating to the developing institution.

Since World War II the public concept of higher education has been changing rapidly. The older assumption of educators was that a college or university should cater to the needs of individuals who took the initiative in seeking education beyond high school. The newer concept is that society has an equal or greater interest in education than the individual. The modern nation needs to educate its people, to seek talent by encouraging individuals, and to foster the development of institutions that will ehlp assure the education of the needed manpower. In the public interest, the institutions as a whole must provide equal opportunity, anticipate manpower needs, and through research and education assist in solving the basic problems of society.

Formerly colleges were highly autonomous. Now they are interdependent. Now for many purposes they constitute a system or a series of sytems. Let me cite a few examples.

When it becomes public policy in a state to provide opportunity to all youth to attend college, the solution is usually found in geographically decentralized public colleges. At the immediate post-high school level, these would be public community colleges. Complementing them are other four-year public colleges and universities also placed in strategic spots throughout the state. These colleges become a system because they need to form a geographic pattern that comprehends the whole of the state. Together with the more complex universities, these colleges may also become part of a larger system of public higher education served with a planning-coordinating board. The function of this board usually is to develop a master plan for higher education in the state and to advise the governor and legislature about the best utilization of the available resources. Thus, in matters of geographic area, tax base, commuting policy, scope or length of the program, and educational role, the individual college is subjected to constrictions within which it must develop its own policy and administer its program.

When colleges, especially private institutions, seek philanthropic funds, they cannot depend as formerly upon the gifts of one or a few individuals. The reasons include the changed federal policy on taxes, with the income tax now siphoning off the disposable income of persons of wealth as well as the dispersion of wealth caused by the growth of incomes in the lower socio-economic brackets. These changes in the national scene necessitate the tapping of a wider base of disposable income than formerly. Still another factor is the ability through cooperative endeavors to secure larger grants from corporations and foundations. In order to solve their financial problems to better advantage, the colleges have resorted to collaboration in raising funds from certain sources. The presidents join in solicitations much as they would in working for a community chest. For the business at hand, they have subordinated their rivalries. It pays to do so.

When colleges discover that they have a common desire to offer a program of benefit to their students but where the combined efforts can conserve energies and resources or attract fresh sources, they often collaborate in organizing and operating the program. For instance, the Great Lakes Colleges Association offers programs abroad in several countries on four continents. A member college will take administrative charge of a particular program but the operation is supported by all of the colleges and is open to students from all. The administration must be coordinated and the Great Lakes Colleges Association has a president and staff for this purpose. Thus 12 colleges banding together voluntarily limit their own programs in order to operate a program for all.

Similar cooperative systems are beginning to evolve as a result of technological advances in storing and retrieving information. The computer is enabling data banks and central depository libraries to be established. Through computer connections the materials can be made instantly available to the member institutions. Thus developments in the use of computers may profoundly influence the interlibrary services of colleges and universities.

It may be argued that the public is too indifferent to higher education as a whole. If so, higher education may be in need of better promotion with the public. Perhaps groups of colleges rather than individual ones should be publicized and promoted. By organizing for this and other purposes, the colleges of a region may bring before the whole community including parents and high school graduates the resources in higher education that are immediately at hand. The Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education is an example. Thus the colleges all benefit and the results may exceed those secured through intensive competition.

With these illustrations in mind, two conclusions may be justified: Cooperative attitudes and policies are to some extent displacing the highly competitive ones; and the administrative attitudes and practices within each institution must be revised to take account of losses of autonomy and of fresh opportunities for joint endeavors.

The trends toward the several forms of cooperation have been having many impacts upon administration. Among them are the following:

First, when functioning within a master plan for a state, the public college or university must do its own planning within this frame of reference. Its role becomes identified by a body that is higher in authority. However, accompanying this constraint is the positive encouragement given to the institution to develop its role as fully as possible. Longer-run planning becomes more possible under the master plan.

Second, cooperative arrangements imply that decision-making will be based upon data that are available for the purpose. Colleges and universities have been notorious for their habits of acting without good information and of secretively hoarding the existing data. Under the changed relationship much additional information must be collected, analyzed, and made available for the decision-making.

Third, if interinstitutional cooperation for some purposes is to be made effective, ideas and efforts must be shared. The implementation of joint programs means that prerogatives may need to be surrendered, concessions made, and certain resources shared. The frame of reference becomes the welfare of the whole group. The methods may require time devoted to interinstitutional committee work. Formulas, often involving many compromises from original positions, must be found for carrying the responsibilities and participating in the fruits of the venture. There is, of course, an offsetting stimulation arising from the interactions.

Fourth, education is becoming much affected by new methods of transmitting knowledge. This includes new techniques of educating by television, the computer, and programmed instruction. These innovations open the way for the use of the educational resources of one institution by others. A kinescope, a programmed syllabus, or a computer data bank can each be made accessible to an indefinite number of students in an indefinite number of colleges. Administrators should keep alert to and informed about these developments. They may prove to be of special value to developing institutions.

Fifth, assuming that a jointly sponsored project may require a director, this person will need to have a superior officer or committee to whom to report. On the other hand, his loyalty should relate to the whole group of colleges.

Sixth, the style of leadership in interinstitutional relationships cannot be authoritarian nor can it function at the extreme of permissiveness. Negotiation is a necessary technique to secure agreements but power confrontations would spoil the climate and lead to dissolution of the relationship. The administrators must be mutually supportive, the theory of organization being the group participative one.

The several implications for administration that have just been described have a degree of applicability to instances of collaboration where one of the institutions is "developing." Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 assumes that one of the institutions is in need of assistance and that this help may be obtained from a more secure or mature institution. The objective is to expand the public services through utilizing more fully the existing colleges. Presumably the college that seeks to have the advantages of help under Title III desires to undergo certain self-analysis and to make efforts to improve its program. The relationships that are established have a number of implications for administration because of the superior-inferior status of the respective institutions.

Certain problems of a psychological nature are inherent in the situation. Each institution has an image that relates to its position in the hierarchical pyramid of recognition. The institution that perceives itself to be high in "standards" and quality is always apprehensive about any move that might adulterate its position. It hesitates to admit students that are below its own students in quality or in achievement. Departmental faculties do not readily accept exchange teachers who seem to them not to be on a par in quality with their own membership.

The institution that is junior in relationship, on the other hand, may be defensive about its own work and may feel sensitive if the plan is not of mutual interest. The tendency of the large university is to make of the contract a "project" as though it were part of the extension services of the university. This arrangement can lead to a minimal offering of discrete services instead of a general transfusion. And the junior institution may find its position psychologically unacceptable.

In order to avoid jealousies and disappointments that impede the operations, the administrators of the respective institutions should clarify at the very beginning between themselves and with the respective faculties the true nature of the relationship. The agreement is one for assistance to the developing institution. It should be clearly recognized and accepted for what it is. But the effort should be a wholehearted one.

It is not uncommon to assume that the developing institution needs development because it has lacked resources, especially financial resources. Often this is not the case. The problem instead may center in the constricting influences of the environment, the provincial outlook of the governing board, or the inadequacy of the educational leadership. The influences emanating from the community, or the sponsoring church, or the alumni may severely inhibit the development of the college. Governing boards that are composed primarily of ministers of the church may have commitments to a creed that will create difficulties for the senior institution in its effort to transform the junior one. The presidents of small church-related colleges and the presidents of Negro colleges, because of the impact of their respective cultures, frequently are authoritarian in their style of leadership and thus inhibit the faculty from initiating or accepting ideas for change. Both the administrators and the faculty may fear to make changes lest they impair the accreditation of the college or the possibility of securing accreditation.

Assuming that it is in the nature of a college not to function on the basis of dogma or through authoritarian leadership, the first move of an institution in qualifying for help under Title III probably should be to clarify its own willingness to undergo change. This may require considerable reorganization, expecially of the administrative structure, attitudes, and methods. In any event, the senior institution should evaluate the prospect of really influencing and developing the junior institution before making the commitment.

After the relationship has been established between the two institutions, the first step should be to engage the developing college in a self-study. This should be an intensive self-examination designed to identify weaknesses and needs, to establish objectives for the development and to prepare the institution for change. In all probability the junior institution needs to go through an intensive period of self-criticism and re-education. Normally this requires a series of group discussions over a period of time involving the whole of the academic personnel and principal administrative officers. Data need to be collected, analyzed, and interpreted. The synthesis in thinking should culminate in a statement of objectives which represent a consensus with the group. It is, of course, very important that the board of control understands the proposals and supports them. Efforts should be made to secure support for the objectives from constituents in the community, the church, or among the alumni. It is essential that a long-run commitment be made and that priorities for the various steps in development be established. The aim is to provide a substantial basis for the developing [illegible] The process becomes based on a plan for action and is the opposite of collaborating on the basis of "hunches" or opportunism.

The representatives of the senior institution should initially be persons who understand the nature and procedures of an institutional self-study. Thus the choice of the initial personnel is of high importance.

The administrators of the senior institution should keep a number of things in mind. One of these is that there developing within higher education a considerable mobility of resources. Travel is much easier and simpler than formerly. The new techniques for the transmission of knowledge become ways in which the senior institution can share its materials without any serious depletion of its own resources.

The senior institution needs to recognize that there has been a migration in manpower from institutions of lesser resources and recognition to those of higher standing. To some extent this movement has drained the weaker institutions of their best faculty. It is unrealistic to expect that this one-way drift will diminish or cease. But on the other hand, recognition of what is happening might bring about a motivation on the part of the institutions that have benefited from the migration to share some of the manpower they have accumulated through temporary loans of personnel. Inasmuch as outside financial resources are available for this kind of purpose, the loaning institution is not seriously handicapped.

It should be noted, however, that the help needed by the developing institution may not wholly correspond with what is most convenient for the senior institution to give. The primary consideration should be the need of the developing college and the senior institution should make the necessary adjustment on the theory that it is participating in a socially important mission in higher education.

Reflecting upon the several points made, it is interesting to consider how many of them are concerned with attitudes, especially administrative attitudes. Authoritarianism in administration stands in the way of interinstitutional cooperation. Feelings of superiority and of defensiveness must be subordinated in favor of the joint effort to help the developing institution develop. Group-anchored attitudes must be overcome through an intensive process of re-education. A feeling of mission with its accompanying excitement and horizon of hope should be induced and cultivated.

Certain skills in administrative leadership need also to be used. The skill of negotiating in order to arrive at a common agreement, the skill of designing and conducting an institutional self-study, the skill of bringing the group of faculty, administrators, governing board, and others to a consensus of thinking about objectives, the skill of jointly administering the program in a manner to make progress toward achieving the objectives are among those that need to be highlighted. Additional knowledge, especially about the developing institution, must also be accumulated and made available. An institutional self-study, for example, assumes both comprehensive and intensive efforts to marshall substantial data that are relevant to the proposed developments. These then are some of the ingredients of attitudes, skills, and knowledge that require administrative adaptation and implementation.

ISSUES AND PROBLEMS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF INTERINSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

James C. Messersmith
Consultant in Higher Education
United States Office of Education

It is indeed a privilege for me to be invited to appear on this program of the Conference on Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education sponsored by the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Cooperation among colleges and universities, particularly the organizational and administrative aspects of such cooperation, is a matter with which I have been directly concerned over the course of nearly the past decade.

At the outset of my remarks today, I should like to state what I consider to be a valid assumption: that the college federation movement has "come of age." Recent events appear to support the validity of this assumption. In April 1962 a National Conference on College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation was held at Princeton, New Jersey. Participating in the conference were directors and trustees of 24 federations, representing 223 colleges and universities. One of the primary topics of concern of the Princeton conference was that of the nature and function of the executive officer of interinstitutional federations, of the board of directors of such federations, and the relationship between the executive officer and the board. Following the Princeton conference, a number of meetings were held by executive officers from several of the participating groups to review the current situation and to examine the possible future course of the movement toward increased college federation.

In June 1964 a 10-day Workshop on College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation was held at the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. A series of 10 papers was presented to those enrolled in the workshop. Enrollees [illegible] met in seminar sessions and prepared reports.

The entire program of the 1964 Annual Meeting of the American Council on Education was devoted to a consideration of the topic: "Autonomy and Interdependence in Higher Education." Let us not pass on without noting the very meeting here in progress.

Administrative leadership is unquestionably the key element in initiating, organizing, and successfully implementing interinstitutional arrangements. Unless each institutional administrator demonstrates a willingness to provide the broad-range leadership required, efforts to promote cooperative undertakings--no matter how feasible and desirable these undertakings may be--are probably doomed to defeat.

It is at times difficult for institutions with different requirements, standards, even basic philosophies--institutions which traditionally have taken pride (perhaps undue pride) in their self-sufficiency--to admit that they might benefit from cooperation. However, cooperation

6

fundamentally is not a matter of institutions, but of people the best plans on paper are futile unless the individuals on whom action depends are willingly involved.

Failure of the administrator to provide the required leadership may be due to the fact the "the spirit is willing but the flesh is weak." It is one thing to review the purposes and objectives conceived for his institution by the various "communities of influence"--board of directors, alumni, faculty, students, and benefactors. It is quite another to acknowledge the presence of program gaps and weaknesses of his own institution, or to recognize and accept the strengths of the other institutions with which his own may be considering a federate relationship. It is obvious that, if joint planning and program implementation are to be effective and to achieve worthwhile results, an atmosphere of mutual trust will need to be created as a basis for identifying and discussing institutional strengths and weaknesses.

At this point, a word should be said about planning, for it is a definite prerequisite to the successful establishment of cooperative endeavors. Such endeavors obviously do not happen by chance, but rather as the result of thoughtful consideration and deliberation. While this is especially true of the more highly formalized arrangements, it also holds for informal arrangements. Such topics as--possible types of cooperation, patterns of organization required, steps in program development, and sources of program support may well find themselves on the planning agenda for analysis and discussion. Determinations can be made as to how and to what extent the interinstitutional program may be coordinated with related programs of other agencies in the local, state, regional, or national matrix. Additionally, through the participation of institutional representatives in the planning process, the institutions will be better oriented (and, hopefully, more sympathetic) to the program.

We are witnessing today in increasing multiplicity in the types and patterns of cooperative arrangements in higher education. They range from the strictly informal to the highly formalized. They may be bilateral or multilateral; intrastate or interstate and regional. Some involve publicly supported higher institutions only; others involve only private higher institutions; still others include both public and private higher institutions. Some cooperative arrangements are confined to institutions at the junior college level; others, to liberal arts colleges; others, to more broadly based universities; and still others may include a mixture of some or all of these types of institutions. Associated with some college and university federations are secondary school systems, business and industrial establishments, and government agencies.

Two trends of significance have been recently noted in the pattern of interinstitutional arrangements: (1) The involvement of larger numbers of institutions (as many as 30 institutions have been federated in one "system"). (2) Broader geographic areas encompassed by participating institutions. The specific pattern or character of any interinstitutional arrangement will in all likelihood be a significant determinant in the type of executive officer required, as well as of the role to be played by him.

Job descriptions, as I have experienced them, frequently leave much to be desired. The relative recency of the existence of the position of executive officer of college and university federations makes it especially urgent that the person planning to assume such a position secure as complete a statement and identification of functions of the position as possible. Will he be expected to suggest, or to assist in determining, board policy or will he merely be expected to execute such policy? Will he be expected to be a program operator or simply a catalyst, or both? Will he be expected to identify possible areas for cooperative undertakings and to assist in securing financial support for such undertakings? To what extent will he be called upon to give advice and suggestions to the board and other institutional representatives, including faculty members, involved in specific cooperative projects, and to give direction to the projects themselves? In order to avoid possible pitfalls later on, the prospective executive officer of any interinstitutional federation in higher education will want to secure answers to these and related questions having a direct bearing on his position.

Such information may be secured from various sources. The federation's organizational charter, if there is such a document, will doubtless contain some of the answers. Annual reports and minutes of board meetings may also need to be examined. The board of directors should be requested to supply any additional information required to fill in the blanks.

Should there be a centralization or decentralization in the administration and direction of specific cooperative projects undertaken by the participating institutions? The answer to this question will have a great deal to do toward determining what is expected of the federation's executive officer and the central coordinating office. Where the decentralized pattern of project direction is followed, the central office and the executive officer will probably be required to exercise only a minimum degree of project oversight and control. Primary responsibility for the administration of the project will emanate from the particular institution at which the program is based. Manpower for this purpose may be derived from regular staff personnel of the institution, from outside staff based at the institution, or from both sources. In both centralized and decentralized administration, however, the central office and the executive officer will be expected to maintain current and adequate information on the status of specific projects and activities. Where the board policy is to decentralize project administration, the overloading of regular staff personnel with added responsibilities should be constantly guarded against. Under the pattern of decentralization, also, there is the possibility that institutionally-based cooperative projects may tend to be considered as institutional, rather than inter-institutional. Proper precaution should be taken at all times to avoid the generation of such a point of view and any feelings of friction likely to result from it.

One of the most significant problems with which the executive officer is likely to be confronted is that of stimulating the staffs and faculties-at-large of the participating institutions to an awareness of the potentialities of cooperative undertakings. In the last analysis, it is these persons who must provide the will and the impetus to innovate--to effect interaction, creativity and discovery; it is these persons who must provide the will and the impetus to effect the formulation of proposals and the direction of projects. Interinstitutional improvement, development, and progress depend in large part upon the extent to which staff and faculty members of the several institutions are motivated to move boldly ahead in these areas of endeavor. While some prodding may be required to bring about this motivation, the results will usually be worth much more than the effort involved.

The executive officer may also be faced with the problem of meeting and working with the various interinstitutional committees concerned with individual projects or undertakings. This can become a burdensome task, particularly if the director (executive officer) is expected to meet with all such committees. These committees can conceivably become quite substantial in number and may meet with some frequency. If, as likely, the staff of the central coordinating office is limited, the executive officer may find himself in the position of meeting himself "coming and going."

If such meetings are held at the coordinating office, the executive officer may at least be freed from a too-heavy travel schedule. If the meetings are scheduled elsewhere, however, he may develop a "traveling salesman" complex. Since he will undoubtedly be required to meet periodically with the board of trustees, to travel to foundations, and to visit government and business agencies, he may discover that he is being spread too thin for a satisfactory total performance.

A pitfall to be avoided by the executive officer is that of becoming an agent for each of the member institutions with which he is associated. Practically speaking, the responsibilities of the executive officer and other central office staff should be confined to the cooperative, or joint venture, undertakings of the member institutions. As noted earlier, the executive officer will ordinarily be hard pressed to keep current in carrying out his assignments in this area.

During a lecture which I delivered at the 1964 Catholic University workshop, I observed that at least three principal conclusions might be drawn regarding the position of the executive officer of interinstitutional federations in higher education: (1) That this position is still in the evolutionary role-and-scope stage, and that it may properly be expected to undergo further modification and change and to assume greater significance in the future stages of its development. (2) That there will, simultaneously continue to be substantial variations in this position as found in different cooperative arrangements or institutional groupings. (3) That the person occupying such a position must be highly adaptable, with the capacity to adjust to new situations and conditions, and with sufficient flexibility to meet new demands placed upon him.

My feelings in this regard have not diminished in the meantime; on the contrary, they have been substantially strengthened. For it is becoming increasingly apparent that this new breed of administrator needs to possess a high degree of versatility; yet he must continually guard against the urge to ride off in all directions at the same time. He must be an expert at "playing it by ear," yet not for too long; eventually there must come a time when advance planning and studied organization are available in sufficient measure to enable him to secure an adequate toe-hold on the operation.

If I have appeared to be "accentuating the negative," this has been my intent. For the charge has been made that there is a tendency, in reporting practices, developments, and outcomes related to cooperative endeavors, to minimize or overlook entirely deterrent factors and obstacles encountered. This results in a distorted picture of the true situation.

The truth of the matter is that there is quite likely to be a constant pull-and-tug between conducive and deterrent elements. These factors which encourage or restrict the progress of cooperative endeavors need continuing review and analysis. Critical appraisal, clear-cut recommendations, and proper implementation of recommendations are required to insure the maximum success of such programs.

In conclusion, let me "accentuate the positive" by expressing a personal view that the future appears most promising for cooperative undertakings in higher education. To satisfy the demonstrated need, our colleges and universities will be moving further from the traditional and making more extensive use of innovative, collaborative techniques. That these ventures may be effective, consistent attention and effort will need to be given to planning, program formulation and analysis, organization, administration, evaluation, and--where warranted--appropriate modification.

INTERINSTITUTIONAL EXCHANGE AND MEDIA

Gary Gumpert
Director, Instructional Television Development and Utilization
The University of Wisconsin

According to the media theorist Marshall McLuhan, "electric means of moving of information are altering our typographic culture as sharply as print modified medieval manuscript and scholastic culture."[1] At the present time twentieth century institutions of higher education are attempting to educate students who will spend a major part of their lives in the twenty-first century with nineteenth century traditions of instruction. Hopefully modern electronic media of communication will be instrumental in serving the present and future needs of higher education. Equal access to information, teaching talent, and educational resources for individual schools is indispensable. It is this requirement which relates modern media to the concept of interinstitutional exchange.

> Just as the country's great cities must increasingly function as immense centers of interconnected municipalities, so universities are finding it productive to band together as constellations to accomplish cooperatively what is not feasible to attempt individually because of prohibitive costs and the dearth of scholars in certain areas.[2]

The idea of interinstitutional exchange is more than a philosophical challenge, it is a necessary requirement if the educational demands of tomorrow are to be met. Through electronic media direct instruction and resources could be shared on auditory and/or visual bases. The teaching talent of outstanding faculty members could be shared by a number of institutions. Computers, libraries, and research facilities could serve more than the immediate environment in which they are located. For the daily task of communications, media could shatter the barriers of time and space, so that meetings and conferences would take place without the physical task of bringing people together. Participants will be bound together electronically.

The purpose of this discussion is to describe present media and their application to interinstitutional exchange and to examine the barriers inhibiting an operational form of interinstitutional cooperation via electronic interconnection. It is not within the scope of this discussion to establish a basis of need for interinstitutional cooperation. It is assumed that the present insular condition of higher education is restrictive and self-limiting. It is assumed that the status quo is not satisfactory. Through the utilization of electronic media the present configuration of heterogeneous institutions could be altered to achieve some homogeneity through cooperation without the loss of institutional identity.

Media: Variations on a Theme

A medium is a means of conveying data, a channel of communication. Media can be classified along a number of dimensions:

auditory-visual, electronic- non-electronic, and analog-digital, for example. For the purpose of this discussion a medium refers to an electronic method of transmitting information on an audio and/or visual basis between two or more points of transmission and reception. Within this definition great variation in terminal equipment and output is possible. It is because of such diversity that careful analysis of the needs, functions, and objectives of each discipline is necessary. It is much too easy to become enchanted with the glitter of media technology and lose sight of the rationale for its use. The following material can be considered as a partial inventory of existing communications media. These media can be used by themselves or in combination with others. It is in this area that imagination determines strategy.

Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI)

This means of instruction utilizes electronic signals to exchange information between a computer and students. It is a form of programmed instruction which includes a specially programmed highspeed data processor and student stations.

> The CAI program prepared by the instructor, causes the computer to present material to the student and to accept his typewritten responses. The material presented to the student can be displayed on a screen or typewriter or both. The student responds to the material by operating a typewriter-like printer keyboard which is keyed directly to the computer.[3]

One form of computer assisted instruction related to institutional interconnection involves students at Harvard University learning mathematics from a computer at the University of California, Santa Barbara.

> The computer employing a systems program worked out by Professor Glen Culler of the University of California, solves a problem in calculus or statistics step by step, for a Harvard class. Professor Anthony Oettinger at Harvard opens his class by turning a signalling device and typing the problem on a keyboard, thus programming the Santa Barbara computer. Steps to the solution appear almost instantaneously on the Cambridge screen.[4]

Electrowriter

This system of communications transmits handwritten messages or diagrams to any number of distant viewing stations. The basic elements consist of two electrowriters interconnected via telephone. A projector that magnifies the images and a screen complete the visual components of the system. Generally, the electrowriter is used in conjunction with a two-way telephone hook-up for audio transmission.

Facsimile

With this means it is possible to transmit graphic materials from one site to another. Using a telephone line system and special sending and receiving equipment, hard copy (permanently retainable) rather than screen images constitutes the end product or output. In this way a page of material can be transmitted and reproduced from one institution to another without physically transporting that page.

Dataphone

Utilizing telephone lines, a specially adapted telephone, and a computer or business machine, it is possible to link computers together. The dataphone converts machine language to electrical tones and converts them back to machine language at the receiving point. The dataphone can also be used for normal conversation. The push of a button allows for the transmission and reception of data in such forms as punched cards, punched paper tape, magnetic tape, handwritten documents, and graphics, maps, and charts.

Radio

New engineering developments have uncovered another use and dimension in radio, other than public broadcasting. The "subsidiary Communications Authorization," more commonly known as a "piggyback FM Channel," allows an additional signal to be transmitted on top of the normal FM signal. While the regular frequency model signal is used to broadcast a program, instructional materials can be transmitted via the piggyback channel to specially equipped receivers. It is possible to achieve two-way communication with the addition of a telephone connection.

Slow-Scan Television

This form of communication involves the television transmission of still pictures using relatively inexpensive phone lines rather than the more expensive transmission equipment required for conventional television. A series of separate pictures are transmitted with this method, almost in a slide fashion. A camera transmits an image which is stored in a display tube for a period of six to eight minutes. This image can be erased and a new one displayed, either automatically or manually.

Telelecture

Using a telephone system, this method allows for two-way communication between a speaker and scattered groups. The voice is amplified with a simple speaker arrangement at the reception point. It is possible to arrange slide presentations in conjunction with this system in order to allow for the introduction of visual material.

Teletype

Typewriters can be linked together by phone lines to allow for the exchange of data. A message typed on one machine is automatically re-typed on a second machine remotely located. The typewriter (teletypewriter) also can be used to feed data into a computer with feedback to the originating point.

Television

Television can be defined as the electronic transmission of images in motion with the possible simultaneous electrical transmission of sound. The utilization of television for interinstitutional cooperation should not be confused with the use of the medium as a vehicle for commercial or educational broadcasting. The transmission of a television signal need not be public. Closed-circuit television, for example, is unique because of its design in which coaxial cable or microwave is utilized to transmit signals of images and/or sound to predetermined receiver or monitor locations. Control of reception is, therefore, possible. The facilities of educational television stations might, however, be used for the purposes of interconnection or for intra-institutional transmission of material.

Videofile

A videofile is an automated storage and retrieval system which uses videotape to store documents. The materials can be presented either as images on a television screen or as printed copies. Two-hundred and fifty thousand 8 1/2 x 11 inch documents could be stored on one fourteen-inch reel of videotape.[5] "A basic videofile system consists of a videotape television recorder with a built-in electronic file control unit, a television camera, and indexing unit, television receiver and/or electrostatic printer."[6] The printer is needed if hard copies are required. Remote interconnection is possible with this system thereby increasing the scope of utilization and decreasing costs.

Interconnection

Media are used in varying degrees on university campuses. Most schools have established some form of an instructional media resources center. At the same time, however, interinstitutional use of media has been negligible. The main technical problem in interinstitutional exchange via media is the development of a practical and relatively inexpensive method of interconnection and distribution. That method should allow for the transmission and reception of a variety of media.

> Any electronic communication system whether a microwave network or a television broadcast system, must be designed to transmit a specific amount of electronic information; it can handle less, but the limitation on its potential use is its maximum capacity. If sufficient technical capacity exists, the actual content of the information is not relevant at this point.[7]

Whether the facilities of a common carrier, like the telephone company, or private microwave systems are used, a broad enough bandwidth capable of satisfying all media of communication utilized must be adopted. The problem is rather complex since the technical standards and requirements of media differ. Twelve-hundred telephone channels could be placed in the bandwidth necessary for one television, audio and video, channel. An analogy can be made between bandwidth and a highway. The number of vehicles capable of traveling at a constant speed is determined by the width of the road and the nature of the vehicle. Some vehicles do not require a superhighway, at times a bicycle path would suffice. It is because of these differences that some transmission systems are designated as narrowband, broadband, and wideband. Some media, using ordinary telephone lines, require a narrowband of transmission. Television standards necessitate broadband requirements. A multipurpose electronic interconnection system using a number of media simultaneously requires a wide enough band to allow for the transmission of all channels without interference or deterioration of signal. In terms of the highway analogy, a multiple lane highway is needed in order to allow a variety of vehicles to reach their destination smoothly.

A great deal of planning is necessary if interinstitutional exchange via media is to become a reality on a fairly large scope. Some institutions have organized television networks for the purpose of interinstitutional exchange. Other organizations are currently studying the feasibility of establishing multi-functional educational communications networks. Much of today's planning will be affected by further developments in satellite communication.

Instructional Television Networks

At the present time interinstitutional exchange of instructional materials via television is a reality, although not used frequently as one might suspect. There are complex reasons behind an apparent lack of interest in cooperation. These will be examined later. The extent to which institutions of higher education are involved with televised instruction can be determined by examining the National Compendium of Televised Education published annually by Michigan State University.[8] Forty-five subject listings were compiled from responses of 196 universities, 591 colleges, 30 seminaries, 44 institutes, and 31 television stations. This represents a total of more than four-hundred thousand students receiving a portion of their instruction via television.[9] Most of this activity is intra-institutional in nature.

Much of today's televised instruction is recorded on videotape. Since a lesson is therefore preserved and repeatable, the videotapes automatically become a possible commodity available to other institutions. The amount of produced material available on a rental basis is impressive, although, at times, the quality is inconsistent. While the rental of such material can be negotiated with the individual producing institution, a number of national instructional television libraries have been founded. The Great Plains Instructional Television Library, located in Lincoln, Nebraska, and the National Center for School and College Television, in Bloomington, Indiana, are two such organizations. Interinstitutional cooperation, in the case of such libraries, is indirect, since the institutions negotiate with the library rather than with each other.

There are some examples of direct electronic television interconnection between institutions. Between 1957 and 1964 the Oregon

State System of Higher Education initiated a project in which four institutions were interconnected by television. "The basic rationale underlying the study was that research activity should be directed toward development of an understanding of the potential of interinstitutional television for the improvement of instruction."[10] The results of the study pointed out that "the capacity for achieving the objectives seems to exist and benefits were registered during the experimental period."[11] Although a willingness existed for experimentation with interinstitutional television, "there has been little evidence of desire or determination to continue interinstitutional television instruction on a regular basis."[12] During the 1966-67 academic year the Oregon interinstitutional system is planning only one televised course. Television is used, but the emphasis has been placed on intra-institutional utilization.

The Texas Educational Microwave Project (TEMP), with headquarters in Austin, interconnects eleven institutions via television. According to Professor Glen Starlin, in a report on "Interinstitutional Communications Networks" prepared for the Minnesota Interinstitutional Television Feasibility Study, TEMP has encountered "a number of problems in communications and interpersonal relations, along with some complaint of too much dominance from the University of Texas in Austin."[13]

> These factors, coupled with excessive administrative pressure and control during the first several years of TEMP's existence created enough problems to bring

> the project close to disbandment. During the last two years, however, a new organization has been developed in which the campus faculty committees are given as much power as possible in determining use, course offerings and evaluation. This has brought an improvement in faculty attitude toward the program.[14]

A federally supported study is now examining the alteration of the present organization into the Educational Microwave Communications Network (TEMCON). Additional communications media would be involved. Some of the functions considered for TEMCON include:

> The total library resources of TEMP member institutions available to students at every member campus; individualized instruction through use of computerized programs; access to computers for purposes of research even for those students and faculty whose institutions do not have a computer...[15]

There are universities and colleges who share instructional resources by exchanging videotapes. A number of states are seeking to establish state educational television networks. In some areas closed-circuit television networks are important means for providing instruction on a primary-secondary school level. In particular, the South Carolina Educational Television Network, the Delaware E.T.V. Network, and the Washington County, Maryland, Closed-Circuit Television system should be noted. For the most part, however, electronic television interconnection between institutions of higher learning has met with only moderate success.

Educational Communication System

As the result of a project sponsored by the United States Office of Education and the National Association of Educational Broadcasters the Educational Communication System has been proposed. This system encompasses a multi-media approach to communications. After a period of study which included an examination of institutional cooperation and a survey of faculty members and administrators in regard to their views on electronic interconnection, a design of three model systems of interconnection was conceived.[16]

1) The Interstate (Midwest) model includes the Big Ten Universities and the University of Chicago.

2) The Intrastate (Oregon) model includes all institutions of higher education in the state of Oregon.

3) The Educational Resource Model is somewhat unique, since the intent is to link this model to the Interstate and Intrastate models. The purpose is to make available the resources of research facilities, cultural and scientific facilities, libraries, and various information centers found in the Northeast section of the United States between Washington, D.C. and Boston.

The next phase for ECS is to implement the present model designs into an operational phase. It is during this fourth phase that careful evaluation and feasibility studies will be conducted on the entire project.

The implications of ECS and the concept it represents are far-reaching.

> Many aspects of the ECS project already are affecting other educational communications activities. States which established educational television networks, for example, appear to be broadening their operations to follow out the logic of a complete multi-purpose system. There seems to be a growing realization that the communication requirements of education are becoming more diverse, and that meanwhile, technology is closing the gaps between communication media. Universities now work to communicate not only by telephone, but through high-speed computer transmission, graphic displays of library information, televised course segments, rapid transmission of printed research data, etc. Some universities are beginning to reflect this concern in their administrative structures, placing all communications operations under a single staff authority.[17]

The report on ECS goes on to point out that electronic interconnection would not only be beneficial to universities, but to such agencies as Research and Development Centers, Regional Educational Laboratories, and the Educational Research Information Center, as well.

EDUCOM

The Inter-University Communications Council was formed in October 1964. Its initial purpose was the dissemination of information in regard to new technologies and their relationship to the functions of higher education

> New concepts, techniques, and applications of the communication sciences develop with increasing rapidity.

> There is a need for orderly acquisition and dissemination of information about these developments, to expedite the transmission of information, in useful form, from developer to consumer. EDUCOM will maintain a fund of current information about the capabilities of the nation's universities with relation to educational communications developments.[18]

EDUCOM, by October 1966, included fifty institutional members in twenty-six states. One reason for its formation was to fill a void in coordination between the development of media technology and the academic community. While a number of organizations and disciplines are individually studying the uses of media for such function as storage-retrieval, communications, and information processing, many of these efforts overlap and EDUCOM seeks to establish some form of liaison between these separate groups.

As a result of a meeting of EDUCOM members held in Boulder, Colorado, during the summer of 1966, a proposal has emerged seeking to establish a pilot Interuniversity Network (EDUNET).[19] This communications network would connect all EDUCOM member institutions. A local information center would be established at each institution. "These stations would conduct control and switching functions for information stored in or transmitted over them."[20]

> From computers operating in a time-sharing mode such centers would radiate local networks to terminals in carrels, offices, libraries, classrooms, laboratories, dormitory rooms, clinics, and hospitals in the region. A user could type a request from any

> terminal and receive an immediate response, either by a visual display or a modified TV screen also linked to the computer. He also could signal the computer by pointing or drawing with a light pen on the TV screen.[21]

It is assumed that the Interuniversity Communications Network will be interconnected with other regional and specialized networks, such as state and regional television networks and the three models constituting the Educational Communications System.

Communication Satellites and Interinstitutional Cooperation

Electronic interconnection requires expensive long-distance land lines and/or microwave systems. With the development of satellite communications, the scope, flexibility, and immediacy of cooperative instruction could be increased. The Early Bird satellite has already been used in an inter-continental instructional experiment. On May 31, 1965, French language students at the West Bend, Wisconsin, high school had a two-way closed-circuit television conversation with an English language class at Lycee Henri IV in Paris, France.[22] A domestic satellite system could facilitate a similar visual dialogue among colleges throughout the United States.

On August 1, 1966, the Ford Foundation proposed a domestic, non-profit satellite system before the Federal Communications Commission. The proposal suggests a service utilizing four communication satellites which would provide six channels for commercial broadcasting three instructional channels for primary-secondary schools, one instructional channel for universities, and one channel for educational television.[23] It would be possible to add channels by increasing the number of satellites.

Whether the Ford Foundation proposal or another plan is adopted, it is almost a certainty that a domestic communications satellite system will become a reality. Within that system one or more channels will be devoted to instructional uses at the higher educational level.

Wilbur Schramm, Professor of International Communications at Stanford University, has described the possible value of communication satellites for higher education:

> We can envision lecture or interview series with great scholars of the world, with chiefs of state, with heads of national and state government agencies or Congressional Committees. Universities could share lecturers, campus to campus, or join together in seminars with two-way questions and discussion.
>
> A communication satellite could provide voice links from some of the participating classrooms back to the teacher, for questions and discussion with the television teacher. In the same way circuits could be maintained back to the studio, or to some other central places where the responses of pupils to questions or to opinion items might be recorded . . .
>
> The satellite could be a channel for the rapid exchange of data between scholars or libraries. The scholars of this country, suffering with problems of information storage and retrieval, delays in getting articles published in journals and difficulty in keeping up with the new knowledge from other laboratories, could conceivably by means of the new channels, be able to call upon a distant colleague for information, or order information from a library or data bank.[24]

The Barriers of Electronic Communication

The relationship between satellite systems of communications and the future of interinstitutional cooperation is clear. They are inexorably bound together. Nevertheless, there is a possibility that increased cooperation will not occur. While the technology of electronic communication continues to progress in both sophistication and simplicity of operation, numerous barriers block its path toward utilization.

Fear of Technology

Many faculty members have an innate fear of automation entering their classroom. This apprehension is generally based on the feeling that machines and media will replace the teacher in function. The fear is well founded, _if_ new teaching techniques and configurations are not applied in conjunction with the new technological advancements. Machines need not dehumanize the teaching-learning process.

> Instead of each faculty member doing his own individual information processing in repetitive lecture sessions, often to large numbers of students, he might reconceive his role as a teacher. He might let the textbooks, the taped television lectures by the country's leaders in each speciality, and the computerized programmed instruction handle the problem of communicating the rote information, the basic facts of the field. The student could then take objective examinations to indicate knowledge of a small or large segment of the field and after that he could meet with a faculty member.[25]

In this way, the teacher becomes free to teach, rather than channel data to a mass of anonymous students. As fervently as teachers may deny it, the feedback occurring from a class of four hundred students seated in a lecture hall is insignificant. The concept of a tutorial dialogue should be the ideal, not the impersonality of massive lecture halls.

The conservation of faculties toward the use of media is important, however, since it provides a means of checks and balances. Often media are oversold without an analysis of the needs and objectives of the disciplines for which they are to be used. Hopefully, the use of media will be based on a goal to improve instruction, not just to duplicate instruction as it now exists.

Institutional and Faculty Ego

Whereas media might be used within an institution, the chances are that interinstitutional cooperation in the use of that material is doubtful. It is doubtful, even if a controlled evaluation has been made of the techniques and materials and their effectiveness proven. Faculty members will look at the new material and question its suitability for their special and unique institutions. According to James S. Miles, Director of Radio and Television at Purdue University and one of the principal investigators of the Educational Communications System:

> the stumbling blocks to interinstitutional cooperation reside in a lot of ego centered professors. The majority of these individuals are convinced that they have the best way to handle a particular group of subject matter and, consequently, they are not at all interested in securing what they consider to be some second rate material from elsewhere.[26]

A similar reaction is reported in the Oregon report dealing with interinstitutional teaching by television. While there were some positive expressions of interest, a greater number of complete rejections of interinstitutional television instruction occurred. "There was a marked tendency for departments to prefer to originate a course, i.e., have a member of their staff teach the televised course, than to receive it by interinstitutional television from another institution."[27] The rejection cannot be considered a vote against the use of, in this case, television, but more a recognition of its importance. "There seemed to be intangible, factions of prestige and status compounded with the problems of origination and reception."[28]

Faculty Autonomy and Control

The development and production of course materials, with interinstitutional exchange in mind, should consider the needs of those other institutions. If joint use is the aim, joint planning would facilitate the process. Academic freedom includes autonomy and control in the classroom. The reception of instructional materials, without some relationship or influence in the planning of that material, becomes a relinquishment of control. This argument might not be considered logically valid, but its emotional validity is quite certain. One of the conclusions reported in the Oregon study was that faculties were more prone to accept intra-institutional televised instruction than interinstitutional instruction via the same medium. "Presumably, they feel that they have a greater amount of control in the use of the medium when it is employed on a single campus and that local decisions can reflect to a greater degree their convictions regarding curriculum development and instruction."[29]

Admittedly, even if faculty autonomy and control are preserved, the use of any media which captures and thereby documents moments of a teacher in action, results in the preservation of something very personal. The teacher's privacy is invaded and the shelter of the classroom wall disappears. A somewhat ephemeral and private moment of instruction becomes, in a sense, a public document. While exceptional teaching talent and knowledge can now benefit many more students than ever before, a teacher will also be judged by many more individuals; students, colleagues, and administrators. His insecurity is understandable.

Faculty Rights and Compensations

Aside from the use of electronic media for the sole purpose of interpersonal communication, the question of faculty rights and compensation for the development of instructional resources is an important consideration. Some arrangement should be negotiated between the teacher who is going to be involved in the production of lessons utilizing electronic media, the administration of that institution, and the production agency within the institution concerning rights and compensation.

The teacher, or content authority, will spend considerably more time in developing these lessons than in the traditional method of pedagogy. Once these lessons are completed they most often are preserved on either audio tape, videotape or film, and thus are reusable. The reusability factor is of paramount importance to an administrator who needs to analyze the cost of instruction in terms of cost per student. But what about the rights of the instructor, once he has completed the lessons? The rights of an instructor in regard to a text he publishes is fairly clear. But is a video taped lesson to be considered equivalent to a text? Does the instructor receive royalties? These complex questions apply to both the intra- and interinstitutional development of such materials and need to be resolved for both situations.

Both the instructor and the institution invest a great deal in the preparation of recorded instructional materials. The cost goes far beyond meretime, pencil, and paper. Whereas an instructor devotes time, talent, and intellect in the development of these materials, the institution supports him with costly production facilities, personnel, and resource materials.

In 1963 the American Council on Education asked Dean Fred S. Siebert, Michigan State University, to examine some of these problems. Dean Siebert pointed out that an arrangement covering the following points was necessary to be negotiated between the instructor and the administration:

> a) Initial compensation;
> b) Right to re-use both within and outside the originating organization;
> c) Compensation for re-use both within and outside the originating organization;
> d) The right to specify the life of the program or length of time within which it may be used;
> e) Right to revise a part or all of a program or series of programs;
> f) Right to withdraw the program based on termination of employment, death, reassignment, or obsolescence.[30]

To a certain extent, arrangements which cover those points suggested in Dean Siebert's study will be a matter of personal negotiation. Many institutions are wrestling with the problem and some faculties are legislating policy to cover the rights of teachers and institutions in regard to recorded instructional materials.

The University of Wisconsin faculty has passed such a document. One of the points in that policy deals with the use of recorded material outside the University of Wisconsin, interinstitutional exchange belonging in this realm.

> If either of the two parties plans a use of the recording outside the University system (e.g., rental to a publisher), the written agreement between the two parties should stipulate distribution of fees or royalties which may accrue. Because of the great variance in extent and manner possible instructional usage of recordings (including variance in cost factors), an all-encompassing policy on copyright and fee distribution is not feasible, except one which recognizes the proprietary and traditional rights of both parties.[31]

Each individual participating in programs of this type needs to be aware of his rights prior to his initial participation. It is the obligation of the institution to inform the participants at that time, otherwise interinstitutional exchange may indeed become painful and perhaps impossible.

Copyright Legislation

The entire problem of copyrights is now before the United States Congress. A new bill has been drawn up, although not yet passed by Congress. There is neither room nor time to discuss all of the facets of copyright law as they apply to electronic communications and education. The matter is extremely complex.

One important aspect of copyright law and its relationship to education is the "Fair Use" privilege. Fair use is a limitation on "exclusive right" of copyrighted works. The new legislation states the following in regard to "Fair Use": ". . . the fair use of a copyrighted work, . . . for purposes such as criticism, news reporting, teaching, scholarship, or research, is not an impingement of copyright."[32] The difficulty arises, however, when the "Fair Use" privilege is exercised for instructional purposes, and that material is recorded for repeatable and multiple utilization.

If electronic networks are going to interconnect various resources of published research data whereby each reception point can receive a record of that data, is this to be a violation of the law?

Professor Miller has stated:

> Although it is generally held to be desirable in the public good to continue to reward the creative enterprise of authors by royalties - which many university professors receive - it is also desirable to have unrestricted - not necessarily monetarily free - access to scholarly and scientific information, and the copyright law should not restrain this.[33]

Although there are barriers on the road to interinstitutional exchange through the use of modern electronic media, they are not insurmountable. They must, however, be dealt with realistically, not wished away or ignored.

The Electronic World of Tomorrow

The plans and dreams for interinstitutional exchange are intertwined with the development and acceptance of electronic means of interconnection. The potential inherent in this alliance is exciting, but the present problem is that the development of media technology is ahead of education's ability to utilize media for the improvement of the teaching-learning process. The future requires the equilibrium of these two forces.

In the future, campus boundaries will become blurred, perhaps disappear. Some institutions may remain independent and self-sufficient, but for many interdependence will be their greatest strength.

Interdependence should not be misinterpreted as suggesting relationships predicated upon the affluence of one institution and the need of another. Interinstitutional cooperation, with or without the utilization of media, must be approached with a philosophy based upon collaboration not patronage. Because of the technical complexity of media an organizational superstructure might be necessary, but the intrinsic purpose of strengthening the teaching-learning-research process must be given paramount stress. In order to avoid the breeding of technology for the sake of technology the educator needs to learn about the functions and potentials of media so that needs can be translated into action. Even though some institutions might have more extensive media facilities the collaboration of benefiting institutions is required. This necessitates the early involvement of all participants in the developmental phase of projects. Involvement should not be delayed for the utilization phase. If the basic premise of collaboration is accepted, each institution will have access to unlimited research, instructional, and computer resources. Nation-wide interpersonal contact among colleagues will enhance a sense of currency for both teaching and research. Teaching by dialogue will become a normal occurrence. The instructional use of electronic media will not necessarily be a one-way mode of communication. Two-way communication giving rise to the dialogue method, will be of great importance. A class in one institution will listen to and question an expert located at some distant point. Two scientists will not only compare notes, but examine each other's experimental methodology. The potential is only limited by one's lack of creative imagination.

While the scope of electronic interconnection will be great, utilization will be selective. Local, regional, and national networks will be interconnected. With the addition of satellites a world-wide educational communications system will extend the campus beyond national boundaries. All this may happen - if media are considered more than devices threatening the calm of traditionalism.

1. Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964), p. 171.

2. Stanley F. Salwak and William Deminoff, *The Committee on Institutional Cooperation: Annual Report 1964-65* (West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University, 1965), p. 4.

3. John P. Witherspoon *et al.*, *Educational Communications System: Phase III* (Washington, D.C. National Association of Educational Broadcasters, October 1966), p. 270.

4. Michel Beilis (ed.), "Harvard - UCSB Link," *The Education Exchange* (New York: American Telephone and Telegraph Corporation, 1966), pp. 6-7.

5. "Videofile Document and Retrieval System," *Ampex Corporation Fact Sheet* (Redwood City, California, 1966), p. 6.

6. *Ibid.*

7. Vernon Bronson and James A. Fellows (eds.), *Standards of Television Transmission: Factors Affecting Microwave Relay and Closed-Circuit Transmission of Educational Materials* (Washington: National Association of Educational Broadcasters, June 1964), p. xiii.

8. Lawrence E. McKune (ed.), *Compendium of Televised Education*, XIII (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, September 1, 1966)

9. *Ibid.*, p. i.

10. Glen Starlin and John E. Lallas, *Inter-Institutional Teaching by Television in the Oregon State System of Higher Education* (Eugene, Oregon, August 1964), p. 5.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 34.

12. *Ibid.*

13. Glen Starlin, "Inter-Institutional Communications Networks," *General Appendices to the Report of the Minnesota Inter-Institutional Television Feasibility Study* (Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota, January 1967), p. 12.

14. *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

15. Hugh Greene (ed.), *Instructional Television Newsletter* (Austin, Texas: Texas Educational Microwave Project, January 1967), p. 1.

16. Witherspoon, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 261.

18. James G. Miller, "EDUCOM: Interuniversity Communications Council," *Science*, Vol. 154, p. 484.

19. *Ibid.*, p. 485.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 486.

21. *Ibid.*

22. Lee S. Dreyfus and Gary Gumpert, "Students Visit Via Satellite," *National Association of Educational Broadcasters Journal*, XXV (May-June, 1966), pp. 6-13.

23. *Comments of the Ford Foundation in Response to the Federal Communications Commission's Notice of Inquiry of March 2, 1966, In the Matter of Domestic Non-Common Carrier Communications - Satellite Facilities by Non-Governmental Entities*, Docket No. 16495 (New York: The Ford Foundation, August 1, 1966), Table I.

24. Wilbur Schramm, "Instructional Television," *Reply Comments of the Ford Foundation in Response to the Commission's Notice of Inquiry of March 2, 1966, and Supplemental Notice of Inquiry of October 20, 1966, in the Matter of the Establishment of Domestic Communications Satellite Facilities by Non-Governmental Entities*, Docket No. 16495 (New York: The Ford Foundation, December 12, 1966), pp. 90-91.

25. Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 487.

26. Letter from James S. Miles, Director of Radio and TV, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana, December 20, 1966.

27. Glen Starlin and John E. Lallas, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

28. *Ibid.*

29. *Ibid.*, p. 37.

30. Fred S. Siebert, *Copyrights, Clearances, and Rights of Teachers in the New Educational Media* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1964), p. 50.

31. University of Wisconsin Radio-Television Committee, "Policies Concerning University Development and Use of Recorded Instructional Materials," (University of Wisconsin, Madison Campus, Faculty Document 42 - January 13, 1966), p. 3.

32. United States Congress, *A Bill For the General Revision of the Copyright Law, Title 17 of the United States Code, and for other Purposes*, H.R. 4347, 89th Cong., 2d sess., 1966, p. 80.

33. Miller, *loc. cit.*

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE SPIRIT: A CASE STUDY

C. M. Charles
Professor of Education
San Diego State College

THE PLACE AND THE PEOPLE

At the lower end of California, 100 miles inland from San Diego, lies an ancient sea bed called the Imperial Valley. It meanders southward, taking the name Mexicali Valley where it crosses the border. A frightening desert at the turn of the century, it is now a sea-level valley of fantastic agricultural production. To make it so took some thought, a lot of money, a staggering amount of work, and water from the distant Colorado River.

The first settlers, and most of the later ones, were men who had little besides strong backs and an uncommon determination to make something for themselves before they died. They had no easy time of it. In those days you couldn't escape the terrifying summer heat or the cutting winter winds, or the dust, or the mud-choked drinking water. Most who managed to stick it out did squeeze their pot of gold from the soil. The others left, or died, broke.

These settlers had and had not. They had the strongest of wills. And to a person, they developed pride--pride in making it where others couldn't, pride in turning baked clay into alfalfa and melons. They did not have education, "culture," tradition in genteel ways. Life was a harsh matter, and the man addicted to the finer things soon had his spirit broken. In years since, the emotional and intellectual climate has been slow to change, which is to say that the 80,000 Americans of Imperial Valley and the 400,000 Mexicans of Mexicali Valley see little need for education and the affairs of the mind.

THE NOT-SO-LUSTY INFANT COLLEGES

Still, education has come. The Americans have had their public schools, and more recently, a small public junior college. The Mexicans have had their preparatorias and their special normales for teachers. But despite a clamor here and there, no one really thought it worthwhile to set up any sort of regular, four-year college.

For the Americans, the first one came by force. In 1959, over the protests of a few community leaders who dreamed of an Imperial Valley state college, the California legislature ordered San Diego State College to open an off-campus center in El Centro, the largest American city in the area. It was established for the express purpose of upgrading the qualifications of the public school teaching force, a large percentage of whom held substandard credentials. The institution, now called the Imperial Valley Campus of San Diego State, enrolls 300 students and offers the B.A. degree, some graduate work, and courses necessary for elementary and secondary teaching credentials.

In 1960, the Territory of Baja, California became a Mexican state. At once, a state university, la Universidad Autónoma de Baja California, was organized. Headquarters were established in Mexicali, its capital city, which had burgeoned into the fourth-largest city in Mexico, and branches were set up in Tijuana and Ensenada. In five years its enrollment grew to 2,000 students, who, having no campus, attend classes at night in various parts of the city.

On the heels of la Universidad came a private engineering school, Centro de Enseñanza Técnica Y Superior (CETYS). It opened its doors in 1961, in a move calculated to halt the siphoning of Mexicali's most promising young technical minds away to the old and thriving cities of Monterrey, Guadalajara, and Mexico City. Despite high tuition, the enrollment has risen to 400 students.

In the fall of 1965, the Imperial Valley Campus of San Diego State moved to the city of Calexico, an American town of 9,000 that directly adjoins Mexicali. Thus, there came to be within a distance of a few miles, three institutions of higher education located ostensibly in the same city, though Mexican on one side and American on the other. They had common characteristics and problems--limited facilities and budgets, small libraries, disappointing enrollments. And above all, they had to operate in the midst of general lack of concern over higher education.

UNIVERSITY OF THE SPIRIT: CONCEPTION AND STRATEGY

Early in the fall of 1965, shortly after the move of the Imperial Valley Campus to Calexico, the idea of the "University of the Spirit" was conceived.

John Stepling, a Calexico newspaper publisher and city councilman brought together Joseph Rodney, Director of the Campus, and Arthur Feldman, American Consul in Mexicali, to discuss matters of mutual concern. Rodney believed strongly in the potential value of the Campus to the Valley, but he recognized that the general anti-intellectual tenor of the area would be slow to change. He wondered how to build interest in higher education. He felt, moreover, that if the Campus were to reach its potential, it had to attract numbers of capable Mexican-Americans[1] who made up a sizeable segment of the population but rarely attempted higher education.

Feldman, for his part, was constantly alert to possibilities for improving relations between the Mexicans on one side and the Americans on the other. Relations between the countries, customarily very good, had been strained by controversy over high salinity of the Colorado River water flowing from the U.S. into Mexico.

The discussion quickly began to bear fruit. Rodney speculated that one way to attract Mexican-American students would be to enroll education-oriented Mexican students from Mexicali. He judged that their presence and success, plus word of mouth, would start Mexican-

American lay groups and high school graduates thinking seriously about the possibilities of higher education. Feldman agreed. He felt too that some sort of student exchange would arouse very favorable reactions in Mexicali and do much to maintain amicable relations between the two countries.

As they talked, vistas expanded. Rodney spoke of an exchange of professors and of cooperative use of libraries. Feldman dreamed of cultural exchange in art, music, and theater. They concluded the conference with an agreement to bring together the heads of the two major colleges in Mexicali to explore further the possibilities that had arisen.

A week later, a second conference was held in the American Consulate in Mexicali. In addition to Rodney and Feldman, participants were Santos Silva-Cota, president of la Universidad Autónoma de Baja California, and Fernando Macías Rendón, Rector of CETYS.

Silva-Cota, a medical doctor who in addition to his presidential duties served as head of social security and as state coroner, at first received Rodney's and Feldman's ideas with reserve. His position as president was tenuous, and his initial caution seemed to be an unwillingness to splash in already rough waters. Subsequently reassured, however, he proved genuinely interested and helpful in effecting cooperative plans.

Macías Rendón, of CETYS, was enthusiastic from the start. An engineer with a master's degree from Virginia Polytechnic, he knew and valued gringo ways of getting things done, and he thought his students would benefit from contact with Americans.

The Consulate conference did not disappoint Rodney and Feldman. Before they adjourned, the participants agreed in principle to a spring semester exchange of students, to the immediate cooperative use of the three libraries, and to a cooperative series of cultural events. They also agreed to explore means of exchanging professors in the fall of 1966.

UNIVERSITY OF THE SPIRIT: ACTUALITY

That the cooperative venture moved quickly--that, in fact, it moved at all beyond the talking stage--remains a tribute to Rodney. Almost singlehandedly, he masterminded the cooperative plans. Feldman acted as facilitator, cutting and bypassing international red tape where possible, serving as indispensible go-between, and arranging numbers of meetings in Mexicali. Silva-Cota and Macias Rendon actively supported and encouraged the activities and helped secure facilities as needed.

When the spring semester, 1966, opened, the three institutions had, at a stroke, expanded across international boundaries. Libraries were opened to students of all three institutions. Curricula and the pool of instructional talent were enlarged. Unprecendented arrangements allowed a small, select group of six Mexicans and five Americans to enroll in their own institutions, pay normal resident fees there, but walk across the border to attend a class in a foreign institution.

Cooperative cultural events began early in the semester, too. Large numbers of Mexican students and adults, interested in classic American motion pictures but unable to obtain them in Mexico, had only to walk seven blocks into the United States to view the films obtained by San Diego State. Capable language students translated the dialogue, and each session evoked a startling amount of comment and discussion. In return, American students were permitted to be among the few outsiders to view official Mexican films of the revolution, taken during combat.

Both the Brass Choir and the Concert Band from San Diego played to overflow audiences of Mexicans and Americans in auditoriums in Mexicali, and the Mexican students reciprocated with performances by the Estudiantil de Guadalajara and exhibitions of art by Mexican painters.

By the end of the semester, interest had risen to the point that 100 students traveled from Mexicali to San Diego to tour college facilities there, and groups of American students began getting acquainted with the city of Mexicali, which strangely few had come to know through literally living next door all their lives.

SUCCESS AND FAILURE

By the end of the spring semester, 1966, the grand attempt proved heartening in most respects, but discouraging in others.

The cooperative cultural affairs were thoroughly successful. They were valuable, well done, and enthusiastically received, and they afforded unique opportunities to hundreds of students.

The student exchange succeeded for the Americans and failed for the Mexicans. The five Americans, all competent in Spanish, completed their work with no unusual problems. They all reacted favorably to the experience and indicated they wished to attend additional Mexican classes. The Mexicans, however, discovered in the first class session that their command of English would not sustain them, and they did not return to the class. Immediately, Rodney began searching for means to acquire instantaneous translation equipment. Funds were requested from the Rosenberg Foundation, but were not granted. Finally, several months later, John Stepling succeeded in securing the donation of private money to purchase and install equipment to accommodate 40 students.

Despite the best efforts of Consul Feldman, individual government regulations covered most paths with annoying and frustrating obstacles. Movements of students remains a problem on both sides of the border. Crossing the line with musical instruments requires much delay and paper work. Some Mexican professors, because of political inclinations and activities, have difficulty gaining entrance into the United States. Administrators of the institutions decided against public identification of approved and unapproved professors, thus killing the proposed professorial exchange.

INERTIA AND REGROUPING

Despite numerous problems, the outlook remained bright. Then, before operations began in the fall of 1966, the entire project came to a complete halt. Unexpectedly, the field staff for the California Coordinating Council on Higher Education, after reviewing the original purpose for which the Imperial Valley Campus was established, reported that the purpose had been achieved. They recommended discontinuation of the campus.

In the hearings held in late fall, Chancellor Dumke of the State Colleges, President Love, and others, effectively put forth the opinion that the Campus was in fact performing important and valuable functions. The staff recommendation was rejected by the Coordinating Council, and the permanence of the Campus explicitly assured.

But so far as the University of the Spirit was concerned, an entire semester had been totally lost. And developments on the Mexican side assured that another semester would be lost, as well.

In November, Silva-Cota was deposed as head of la Universidad. Immediately, Pedro Mercado, previously head of the School of

Oceanography in Ensenada, was named successor. Congenial and competent, Mercado at once indicated interest in remobilizing cooperative efforts, but basic plans of operation remain to be established.

Shortly afterward, Macias Rendon resigned as rector of CETYS, to move into the National Ministry of Education in Mexico City. His successor has not been named, and it is doubtful that CETYS could be involved again in the project before the fall of 1967.

Nonetheless, the machinery is moving again. The instantaneous translation system was completely installed in January, 1967. Rodney is again planning strategies and so is Feldman. Meetings have been arranged with Mercado. These men expect that when the fall semester opens in 1967, the University of the Spirit will cut quite nicely through the chain-link fence that separates the United States and Mexico.

NOTES

1. Mexican-Americans are American citizens of Mexican heritage, living in the United States. Mexicans are citizens of Mexico.

COOPERATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Raymond S. Moore
Consultant in Higher Education
United States Office of Education

In probing for information which the U.S. Office of Education needed for the implementation of certain legislation we were surprised to find that no basic study had been done on interinstitutional cooperation in higher education. At the time we could find no other agency interested in doing such a study, so we ventured to do it. We soon found why so many have shied away from this research. It is necessarily massive and complex. But it has been highly rewarding, and revealing of attitudes and conditions we did not know existed.

The historic struggle of the American college and university for excellence and with economics has since World War II, and particularly with the advent of Sputnik, both expanded and intensified. The unprecedented advances in knowledge and technology are in part responsible. But perhaps even more significant are the new mandates which societies and nations have laid at the university's door; they call for social revolutions, revisions of the economy, reevaluation of mores, equality of opportunity, broader provisions for social security, unity among religions and greater intercultural understanding, among many others.

These dilemmas, aided and multiplied by burgeoning enrollments, loss of key staff to industry and research, demands for even more research and more effective teaching, and cross-currents from students and faculty have left many higher institutions bewildered. Some schools have set out to increase endowments, others to expand research programs, still others to upgrade existing programs or to begin new ones. But realistic achievement and balance in facing the barrage of problems has eluded many, if not most.

American higher education is in a more serious state today than many realize. This is not so much the lack of awareness of need nor of willingness to face up to their dilemma as it is the need for careful and systematic seeking of a solution. Long-established private colleges and universities, for example, are seeking entree into the public domain. Church-related schools sometimes rationalize the sacrifice of long-cherished principles.

The facts are that many institutions effectively block their own efforts by a combination of negative factors: First, tradition oftentimes is an effective academic blinder. The school has always been independent, self-reliant, and has prized its autonomy, so why change? Tradition is often a cherished asset, but it can also sink the ship. And indulgence in excessive and provincial thoughts of autonomy can run her aground.

Second, it is oftentimes not only what colleges and universities blindly treasure, but what they in provincialism or indifference turn away from that keeps them from making port. The relatively little use of interinstitutional cooperation as an effective medium in countering institutional problems can be traced in many cases to this rigidity or indifference. The very institutions which proclaim the virtues of scholarship and research are themselves unwilling to experiment. In our study nearly 500 of them turned down cooperation. Some felt they had already arrived. One said it did not need to cooperate; its reason was that it already had a Phi Beta Kappa chapter. This provincialism is brought into sharper focus when I tell you that this statement was made in refusing involvement with developing schools. Others indicated that they normally would cooperate, but for geographical, economic, religious or other reasons found it impracticable. Generally speaking, these were institutions which needed cooperation most.

Fears, suspicions, apprehensions, lack of information or misinformation about cooperation are still sharply limiting its effectiveness in most schools today. And they are scuttling some colleges. Provincial faculty attitudes, fear of loss of students, of competitive positions, of individual or institutional prestige, of faculty or of autonomy are often seen. Many false assumptions clutter administrative and faculty thinking. For example many think that geographic proximity is essential or that consortiums take too much time or that partnerships require organic union. The facts are that most cooperative mechanisms are not geographically close, that most take relatively little faculty or administrative time, once established, and that the more flexible, generally speaking, the greater the likelihood of success.

NEW CLIMATE FOR COOPERATION

Interinstitutional cooperation as an effective device is probably mileniums old, going back beyond Hellenic and Chaldean times. And it has been with us in this country since the early days of Harvard. But the traditional bent of American institutions toward independence, autonomy and individuality has obscured the practical possibility of cooperative effort to enhance these cherished freedoms. They have in effect confused the cooperative with the cartel. The former, carefully implemented, enables all partners to do the original job better. The latter tends to be an amalgam, monolithic in organizational character.

With new communication tools of television, satellites, computers, and others related to these the educational cooperative becomes more practicable than in the past. (Although it should be observed that many consortiums do not need to depend on these). With laser "pipe lines" scheduled to multiply communications channels by millions of times within the next generation, cooperation is about to come of age. Even the most isolated colleges will have access to advanced resources of the elite universities.

With institutional backs to the wall, facing enrollments they cannot handle in the normal course and rising standards they did not anticipate, with larger obligations to society and in some cases stark concern for survival, interinstitutional cooperation should be more carefully examined by all. Few, if any, educators have more than a provincial concept of what this tool can do for their schools. Most tend to limit it to financial concepts, or to student exchange, or to research facilities, or to geographic limitations, ad infinitem, depending on the person and institution. Actually its resources are almost exhaustless and its boundaries almost infinite.

It is precisely because of these possibilities of cooperation and the vast and disturbing needs of higher education that many leading educators have concluded that the time has come when colleges and universities, with few if any exceptions, must cooperate in order to compete, indeed to exist at the levels of quality demanded. Among these men are Logan Wilson, Theodore Distler, Steven Spurr, John Weaver and Samuel Gould. Louis Derthick recently stated that the emergence of cooperation is the most important development in higher education in a decade. It is a commentary on interinstitutional cooperation that institutions well known for the high quality of their programs tend to be the leaders of the cooperation movement. Some are involved in from 50 to 85 distinct arrangements.

Cooperation is "in"! And it is being materially aided and abetted not only by Foundations and Federal money, but also by a number of relatively new organizations and movements. These include the three regional compacts, and the Compact of States and the state coordinating boards in higher education. Many public and private institutions which do not grant degrees also offer worthwhile arrangements. These include such institutions as the Smithsonian in Washington, D.C. and Woods Hole

Oceanographic Institution in Massachusetts.

THE STATUS OF COOPERATION

Our recent U.S. Office of Education study of all colleges and universities in the United States turned up many items of interest. Only a few of these can be presented here. They will be published in synopsis form in the next few weeks, and within several months the full report will be published, including both institutional and consortium directories, providing details on more than 1300 consortiums.[1]

Among some of the tabular and other data the study found that there were more than 1,300 distinct cooperative mechanisms including 1,017 established consortiums and more than 300 emerging consortiums among 1,551 U.S. colleges and universities, of which 1411 or 91% responded in the study.

1. About 93.7 percent of these 1,017 established partnerships were judged successful by member institutions.
2. About 66 percent of these partnerships are bilateral.
3. At least 175 of the 1,017 consortiums contain five or more institutions, and 75 arrangements include 11 or more institutional members. Several involve 100 to 400 or more colleges and universities.
4. There are hundreds of other partnerships which are

subordinated to large multilateral consortiums or are clustered around non-degree-granting resource centers.

5. There are also hundreds more, e.g. medical and teacher internships, that do not fall into the study-s definition of interinstitutional cooperation.
6. There is an unknown number of consortiums which were not reported, for few institutions have a systematic record of their cooperative arrangements, but the number of unknown agreements is thought to exceed 1000.
7. Of the 33 consortiums which were discontinued, about half were reported as successful, but had accomplished their purposes.
8. About half of the reporting colleges and universities expressed an interest in initiating cooperation or expanding cooperative programs.
9. Giving impetus and some of the most knowledgeable leadership in such cooperation in higher education are (a) three regional compacts of states; (b) the developing nationwide Compact for Education; and (c) 38 state higher education organizations of which at

least 22 have specific legislative mandates to advance interinstitutional coordination.

10. About 1,112 institutions were reported as cooperating in one or more arrangements, and 482 were reported not involved in any consortium of which 325 were schools of less than 1,000 enrollments. These figures include branch campuses.
11. Percentage-wise the southeastern United States leads with 75.6 percent of its institutions cooperating.
12. Graduate academic programs make a much larger use of interinstitutional cooperation than the undergraduate. In fact the masters programs alone participate in more arrangements, both bilateral and multilateral, than all baccalaureate programs.
13. Cooperation entertains all combinations of size (large, medium, small), but small institutions under 1000 enrollment are involved with large, medium or other small schools in over 70 percent of all consortiums.

There are several findings concerning developing institutions which I believe are of considerable interest.

1. About 32 percent of all public institutions indicated an interest in cooperation with a view to participating in the upgrading of developing institutions. This compared with 26 percent of the church-related schools, and 15 percent of those in the private sector. These figures include both the helping institutions and those which desire help. They are based on a universe of 433 public, 742 church and 415 private colleges and universities.
2. The upgrading of developing institutions was the strongest of all cooperative administration areas and areas other than academic, in terms of active interest.
3. The fact that nearly two and a half times as many planned consortiums as existing arrangements are counting on Federal funds is in substantial part due to the recent emphasis on developing institutions.
4. Contrary to the opinions of many, the great majority of so-called developing institutions, and those interested in them, are not Negro institutions, or predominantly so.

TYPOLOGIES

Cooperative arrangements are difficult to classify because they are as different as American colleges and universities themselves. But let us consider some types of purpose, structure, function, interchange, initiative, geographic relationships, agreements and control.

Purpose or Rationale. In terms of purpose they may be classified into three groups:

1. Those designed to provide and/or make optium use of highly sophisticated or costly facilities or services or of new knowledge, or to deal with government or other agencies with a unified voice. Although not limited thereto, these tend to be research-oriented. Examples are the National Laboratories at Brookhaven and Oak Ridge. Usually no one institution can make complete use of such facilities. Financing is usually from Federal and large foundation sources.
2. Arrangements which seek to pool existing resources, to strengthen or evaluate academic programs to increase administrative efficiency, to develop new sources of revenue, or to meet local, state, regional, national or international needs. These are often teaching oriented. Examples: the bilateral arrangement between Ursuline and Ballarmine Colleges, the

multilateral University Center in Virginia, and the Great Lakes Colleges Association. Basic financing, if any, is most often by the institutions themselves, with special projects within the consortiums often funded from other sources.

3. Those in which the stronger institutions helps a developing school, in the way the University of Michigan aids Tuskegee; or complements a smaller program as with Columbia University and Occidental College in engineering (although even in such cases the benefits are mutual). Financing has usually been institutional or by foundations, although some Federal aid is now available. However, emerging consortiums are looking more to Federal help than existing arrangements.

While many attempts at cooperation face a variety of obstacles, in nearly all instances where there was evidence of careful planning, both administration and faculty sources agreed that their time and money had proven a sound investment.

Organization Structure. The name "consortium" is applied to all cooperative arrangements regardless of (1) organization form, (2) whether they concerned only one area of activity (simple type) or two or more (complex type), (3) whether their operations centered in a central consortium office or were dispersed from institution to institution or (4) whether they are bilateral (two institutions only) or multilateral (more than two). The cooperative arrangements fall into or among six structural categories. These are offered only to illustrate the variety of forms, and not in any way to compartmentalize the cooperative process:

1. The single bilateral is organized to meet specific needs without reference to other bilaterals. It may be a simple one like the arrangement between Michigan State University and the Merrill-Palmer Institute in the social sciences, or it may be complex like that of North Texas State University and Texas Woman's University which cuts across seven or more disciplinary areas.
2. The fraternal bilateral is similar to the single bilateral in that it is constituted separately from any other consortium. But it has a common partner institution with one or more other bilaterals and is virtually identical in purpose with them. It most often concerns a single disciplinary area. An example is Duke University's Combined Masters Degree Plan in Forestry in which Duke has separate but nearly identical arrangements with at least 65 universities.

3. The federation of bilaterals has the same characteristics as the consortium of fraternal bilaterals except for one important distinction: The federation's bilaterals, while separately constituted initially, tend to work together closely in planning and evaluation with the common partner institution. For this reason such a federation is properly classified as a multilateral. It is illustrated by Princeton University and its partner institutions in the critical languages or the University of Chicago's MA in Humanities program.
4. The multilateral may be (a) simple and centered such as the University corporation for Atmospheric Research which operates the National Center for Atmospheric Research, concentrates on one broad disciplinary area and is constituted of more than two institutions whose center is in Boulder, Colorado, (b) simple and dispersed like the cooperative Ph.D. in classical civilization which includes the Universities of Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin and whose administration changes from institution to institution in the consortium, (c) complex and centered such as the Committee for

institutional cooperation or the city-limited District of Columbia Consortium of Universities, both of which have consortium centers and may include many disciplines, or (d) complex and dispersed like the Connecticut Valley consortium which may be administered from the campus of Amherst, Mount Holyoke, Smith Colleges, or the University of Massachusetts, depending on which institutional representative is the current coordinating officer.

5. The college or university center is considered by many to be the classic of interinstitutional cooperation. Such a center may be bilateral or multilateral, but its chief distinction lies in the fact that it is a cluster of colleges and/or universities such as the Atlanta University Center or The Claremont Colleges, geographically contiguous or within daily commuting distance of each other. It usually provides a teaching, research, or service center, and is sometimes organized separately from member institutions while providing mutual facilities.

6. The constellation of consortiums may be described as two or more clusters of institutions around a teaching, research, and/or service center or program or a central consortium. The Argonne National Laboratory managed by the University of Chicago under contract with the United States Atomic Energy Commission and advised by the Argonne University Association, is in turn the center of a constellation of at least seven multilateral consortiums totalling 100 or more institutions, in addition to numerous bilaterals.

Consortiums sometimes have satellites. The Great Lakes Colleges Association, for instance, has agreements with non-consortium members such as the University of Miami and Nebraska Wesleyan to share its humanities program in Bogota, Columbia. And some consortiums have sponsors, particularly during the developmental period when the emerging arrangement reaches out for administrative guidance or academic support from one or more established universities as the seven-member College Center of the Finger Lakes has done with Syracuse. A foundation or other source of support may also be considered a sponsor.

Kind or Function Specific areas of cooperation were placed in three basic groups on the basis of pilot studies and standard Office of Education categories:

1. Academic: Law, library, education, engineering, religion and theology, humanities and fine arts, social sciences including area studies (and international education) and business administration, life sciences and/or agriculture, physical and earth sciences and mathematics, medicine and para-medical.
2. Administrative: Cooperative administration (records, purchasing, fund raising, faculty and student recruitment, student services, cultural programs, etc.), planning or development, and upgrading of developing institutions (under-graduate schools with potential for quality which are now marginal, or those which are planning graduate programs).
3. Other: Contract or other special resource centers (nuclear labs, museums, etc.), industry-related, regional educational boards or compacts. Relatively few educators or institutions were fully aware of the diversity and promise of these opportunities or challenges for cooperation.

Of Interchange These were first classified into three broad groups: (1) students, (2) staff (including faculty and administration), (3) facilities (buildings, equipment, supplies). And later a fourth category was added: (4) services and information. The overwhelming majority of consortiums were divided about equally between group one and a combination of all groups.

Interchange takes on many forms and hues. It ranges from such singular arrangements as library sharing to highly complex consortiums. It also may take such an extremely flexible form as the CIC or may move knowledgeably into an organized union such as the partnership in which Case Institute of Technology and Western Reserve University have merged four major science departments - biology, chemistry, mathematics and physics.

Faculty interchange takes such forms as joint programs, joint professorships, exchange professorships, visiting lecturships, consultants, coordinating councils or boards, advisory or operating boards for laboratories, museums, etc., recruitment, cooperative administration of various facilities, summer sessions, and participation in exotic, unique or rapidly changing academic areas.

Student interchange may involve joint degrees, combination courses, freedom of facilities, interchange of credits or classes, traveling scholar programs, joint student-faculty leadership seminars, cross registration, or even an interchange for children of the faculty.

Facilities exchange includes such joint use or sharing as laboratories, other research facilities, libraries, esoteric collections, knowledge storage, retrieval or communications equipment, ETV and other audio-visual facilities, cooperative centers, museums, galleries and other key institutions, maintenance publishing facilities, field stations, and joint operation of facilities .

Services or programs interchange may concern accounting, reports, recruiting, fund-raising, student services, foods, purchasing, retirement, insurance, institutional research, admissions and grade accounting, planning and international education.

Initiative Cooperation in the overwhelming number of consortiums is voluntary. But legislative mandates are emerging more and more as an important factor, often through state coordinating bodies. Contrary to many impressions voluntary cooperation is not necessarily in contrast to or opposed to that which is legislatively mandated. Legislative authorization has been repeatedly sought by public institutions in order to co-operate. And some so-called voluntary arrangements were actually weddings of pressure. Credit for actual seeding of arrangements on the other hand was shared by such widely differing entities as students, staff, trustees, community, industry, foundations and other state, Federal and private agencies and institutions.

Geographic Relationships Consortiums involve almost every conceivable geographical combination. They range from contiguous campuses or those nearby in the same city or county, to intrastate, regional or interstate, nationwide and international mechanisms. Regional distribution of cooperatives is roughly comparable in the number of institutions in the regions. The larger the consortium, the fewer of its kind. (Bilaterals account for 66 percent of all arrangements). There was a large percentage of inter-regional bilaterals which is accounted for mainly by three fraternal bilateral programs: Columbia in Engineering, Drew in United Nations and Duke in Forestry.

"Cooperative" or Consortium" Agreements. These involve such words as affiliation, coalescence, collaboration, confederation, coordination, interaction and integration, but for the purposes of this study all are generalized in the word cooperation. Agreements concern organizations which may be called compacts, contracts, cooperatives, cooperative arrangements, federations, partnerships, synergisms or interinstitutional mechanisms, all of which, regardless of size, are comprehended in this study by the word consortium. Effective agreement instruments may take such diverse forms as (1) charter, (2) incorporation, (3) contract, (4) memoranda of agreement, (5) exchange of letters and (6) arrangements that may be classified as spontaneous or completely informed.

Institutional Control The control of institutions was classified in three basic categories: Public, private and church-related. Cooperative arrangements include all combinations of these. The most common grouping was public with public for 243 arrangements or 23.9 percent of all existing consortiums. Private with church-related followed with 189, private with private with 167, church with church with 152, public and private with 121, public and church-related with 73, and there were 72 consortiums which included public, private and church institutions.

FUNDING

Almost 50 percent of all consortiums have no extra-institutional support. Of those which do have outside support, most rely on private sources. Many partnerships benefit indirectly from Federal and other public funds. Among these are the arrangements with such organizations as The Smithsonian Institute, the National Laboratories at Argonne, Brookhaven and Oak Ridge, and the National Center for Atmospheric Research at Boulder, Colorado. Demand for Federal subsidization of cooperative arrangements is clearly on the upswing.

EVALUATION

Not only were 93 percent of the consortiums judged successful by member institutions, but less than one percent were appraised as clearly not worthwhile. Even the great majority of discontinued arrangements were judged favorably. A large number of these had completed their missions.

GENERAL APPRAISAL

Success in interinstitutional cooperation depends more upon things of the spirit than upon physical factors and relationships. While finances, geography and the mechanics of cooperation must be carefully studied and worked out, of much greater moment are the realization of institutional or societal need, mutual regard, a genuine desire to cooperate, and a willingness to build thorough lines of communication within and among all institutions and individuals concerned. Flexibility of organization and agreement are desirable. Anything smacking of monolithicity should be avoided.

Clearly success breeds success in interinstitutional cooperation; thus, if an institution can start simply, or join a going arrangement its chances of success are greater. In any event, it is incumbent upon all responsible educators at all levels to become fully knowledgeable of the ways and means of cooperation. It is in both their individual and institutional future.

NOTES

1. Moore, Raymond S., Advance Report on Nationwide Study of Interinstitutional cooperation, 34 ms. pages, to be published in early 1967 by the United States Office of Education and distributed through the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, and

   Moore, Raymond S., Cooperation in Higher Education, about 550 ms. pages, to be published in early 1967 by the same agencies.

THE PROBLEM IS EDUCATIONAL POVERTY

Fred E. Crossland
Division of Education and Research
The Ford Foundation

These remarks concern developing institutions, and specifically the predominantly Negro colleges. Although we have had much to say here about interinstitutional cooperation in general and Title III specifically, we really have been talking about [illegible]s and techniques to be employed in a war against educational poverty.

At the outset, we need a definition of institutional poverty in higher education. Consider a traditionally organized college which offers a four-year liberal arts program to a residential student body of 1,000 to 1,500 persons. In my judgment, the minimum per capita expenditure--that is, the poverty level--is $1,000 annually for the educational program. Also needed is about $300 per head for plant operation and maintenance, and about $700 per resident student for auxiliary enterprises.

In other words, a minimal expenditure level for operations appears to be $2,000 per year per student--quite apart from any capital expenditures. If any public or private four-year college (in the size range of 1,000 to 1,500 students) is not operating at, or close to, that level, it must be considered impoverished.

During my years as a university administrator and later as a member of the Ford Foundation staff, I have visited or otherwise become acquainted with hundreds of colleges in this country and elsewhere. Each one of them is either developing or decaying. And many of them, Negro and white, simply are impoverished. It may be politically expedient to call them "developing," but we really mean that they are impoverished.

This is my concern about current efforts to help impoverished colleges--and especially the Negro colleges: Title III, federal programs in general, private foundations (including the one with which I am associated), and most of the more affluent cooperating institutions rarely have provided added income in any meaningful and continuing sense. On the contrary, they have tended to increase expenditure levels artificially and on a short-term basis. This is the trap of charity.

The program possibilities we have been discussing here--that is, interinstitutional cooperation intended to benefit Negro colleges--may have therapeutic value in the short run, but they also may hasten the day of bankruptcy for Negro colleges. Too often we have increased the dependency of Negro colleges rather than help them become independent. Crudely put, the challenge is not to provide larger welfare checks, but rather to help Negro colleges get off relief and become financially viable.

This is not to suggest that we ignore the very real and very human educational problems of young people now in the Negro colleges or of those who will be moving through these colleges in the immediate future. While we struggle to guarantee long-term financial viability, we also must strengthen and upgrade faculty and administrators; we must provide remedial and compensatory activities for students; and we must improve facilities, including libraries and other supportive operations. (However, we should keep in mind that every million dollars of new construction on a campus adds about $50,000 per year to the operating budget!) But again I stress this point: every one of these worthwhile educational activities increases the current expense budget without increasing the future income budget. No institution, private or public, can afford that kind of help for very long.

What can we do about this? We must be concerned about such things as long range planning, operations research, and data collection and analysis. These impoverished, developing institutions need to know more about themselves. They need to study how they are using the limited resources they now have. They must ascertain how near they are to the poverty level. They need stronger admissions programs in order to increase enrollment. (The great majority of the impoverished colleges are much too small to be efficient.) They need better counseling programs to reduce attrition. They need to develop supporting constituencies--alumni, industry, church sponsors, and the local community. They need trained fund raisers and trained business managers. They need much more endowment, and they need to know how to get maximum yield from it. They need help in public relations, and in dealing with governing boards and state legislatures. And they need to cooperate with each other. In many cases, they need to develop consortia, they need to merge, and they need to consolidate.

If we really intend to fight and win this war against educational poverty, these are the things we must do. These should be the areas in which interinstitutional cooperation takes place. These are the activities which will help the developing institutions secure more income--not merely spend more of someone else's money!

First must come financial viability. That can lead, it is hoped, to educational and intellectual growth, to self-esteem, and to true participation in the educational community. And that can lead, it is hoped, to true interinstitutional cooperation based upon mutual respect, not on condescending charity. When that happy day arrives, we finally can drop the qualifying adjectives which hobble America's "predominantly Negro" colleges.

IV INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION AND THE COLLEGE STUDENT

PERSPECTIVES ON THE GOVERNANCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

For a variety of reasons--political, economic, geographical, ideological--colleges have found it expedient to unite in cooperative endeavors. This trend is mushrooming today as college populations boom, expenditures soar, programs grow more complex, and the electronic media provide instant communication.

The cooperative idea will necessarily change many aspects of higher education; administrators, too, must adjust to the cooperative policies which are progressively replacing competitive attitudes. Administrative guidance must be especially skillful, Algo D. Henderson observes, in programs involving established and developing institutions. The developing school must be willing to undergo change, while the senior institution must ignore its own convenience and concentrate on the needs of its junior partner.

The movement toward college federation has "come of age," according to James C. Messersmith, who supports his statement by listing recent conferences devoted to the interinstitutional theme. Ultimately, the success of cooperative programs depends on individual administrators, who provide the "key element in initiating, organizing, and successfully implementing interinstitutional arrangements."

The exciting dimension that the new media bring to cooperative ventures is outlined by Gary Gumpert, who believes that the "plans and dreams for interinstitutional exchange are intertwined with the development and acceptance of electronic means of interconnection." What is needed is a multipurpose interconnection system that can accommodate various media at the same time, similar in principle to a modern super highway that can handle many vehicles simultaneously.

The vital role of administrators in cooperative programs is documented in the "University of the Spirit" described by C. M. Charles. Basic to the entire venture was the leadership of the three college executives; it is significant that the program faltered when two of these administrative positions changed hands.

The national inventory of interinstitutional cooperation, briefly quoted in the foregoing chapter, will provide numerous insights into cooperative undertakings. Equally illuminating is Fred E. Crossland's emphasis on the impoverished nature of many developing schools. Established institutions must consider the long range implications of the help given the weaker schools. What is needed is not merely outside funding but guidance to help these schools become economically self-sufficient.

Among the problems facing administrators are decisions on the alternative cooperative arrangements. Will a bilateral exchange, with its one-to-one pairing, result in reciprocal gains or in patronizing and defensive attitudes? Will multilateral programs prove effective or will they weaken the human exchange that is another basic dimension in interinstitutional cooperation? The pros and cons of both arrangements were weighed in the discussion following the papers on the governance of higher education.

PERSPECTIVES ON MULTILATERAL EXCHANGE:

Multilaterals Are Preferable

> I sense in the title of the conference, and certainly in the funding operations of Title III, a clear bias in favor of bilateral programs. My own feeling is that they are perhaps the least promising avenues for assisting the developing colleges. In some instances, they're useful, but only when the two institutions are similar in nature. The analogy to foreign aid seems particularly apt. We've moved away from programs in which America dispenses aid to numerous smaller countries toward development banks and the United Nations as dispensing institutions. There's far less of a danger of patronizing attitudes in multilateral programs. For example, such organizations as the American Political Science Association, the American Physical Association, the Historical Association, or General Electric might work with several schools in discreet programs in various academic areas.

Evade Racial Factor

> The state boards of trustees which support so many of the developing colleges, and particularly the Negro colleges, are sometimes made up of the very worst racists imaginable. They are not going to tolerate any meaningful effort by outside institutions which threatens their continued ability to dictate the policies of those public institutions. We need to seek alternatives to the big sister programs in multilateral arrangements.

Strengthen Natural Groupings

We discovered that there were several small liberal arts colleges in one general area in Tennessee. The presidents and other academic people involved had never met to share their problems and often didn't even know each other. Out of this developed a modest program in faculty enrichment....We are less inclined to look at one-by-one, college-by-college pairing than we are at the broader sort of cooperation among more natural groupings in terms of clientele, ease of communication, and similarity of problems.

Is Distinction Real?

Is the distinction between the multilateral approach and the bilateral approach real? The problem still remains the same, whether aid comes from an association sending in several members or whether you send people to several institutions. If any teacher comes to the developing institution, he will finally come to some one department. He is not going all over the place at once. Similarly, if a teacher goes from our institution to another, he goes to just one institution at a time.

Media Link Institutions

The larger universities are becoming interdependent and literally linked by umbilical cords in the form of Tel-ex linkages and computers. The computor consortium has become an absolutely necessary response to monsterization of computor hardware and software. It is changing the whole basis of research. But what about computors in the developing colleges? Is there interinstitutional cooperation which includes the developing colleges in these momentous changes?

PERSPECTIVES ON BILATERAL EXCHANGE:

Bilaterals Are Costly

In bilateral cooperation, it may take $20,000 just to get one teacher exchange at the assistant professor level. When you take one person out of a department, finance him to go to school, and import someone else to replace him, you are in effect spending two salaries.

Seniority Clouds Issue

Now the logical thing to do would be to send this assistant professor to Wisconsin to get his terminal degree and replace him with a graduate student from Wisconsin. But you can't do that, because the schools won't accept a graduate student in exchange for an assistant professor. This overlooks the fact that at Wisconsin a person who holds the rank of assistant professor or even instructor already has his terminal degree. This runs up the cost of the program. Besides, it takes three of Wisconsin's senior professors to teach the credit load that one of our professors teaches in the sciences. So, on the senior level, a program can cost from $30,000 to $40,000 for one exchange.

Other Complications

Two factors are central. Either this person has work beyond his master's degree, or he hasn't. If he has gone 20 hours, he can't transfer all of these hours to Wisconsin if he didn't start there in the first place. We either let him continue at his current school, or we have to uproot him altogether to start at Wisconsin. If he starts over, this increases the amount, so the easiest solution is to let him continue where he is going. If you are sending him as a student, do you pay him? Otherwise you can't order him to do so. If you offer him a salary, you don't have money in your institution to pay for the slot.

Restrictions Imposed

If you say that 99 percent of the teachers from developing institutions go to the sister schools for further education, it seems that bilateralism imposes enormous restrictions on their education.

Clause Offers Alternative

It doesn't have to work that way. There is a clause to the effect that if the University of Wisconsin cannot furnish what is needed, the student can go somewhere else.

Teaching Program Explained

The National Teaching Program was designed as a separate entity. Its principal purpose was to recruit young faculty talent around the country and have a pool from which the developing institutions could draw. It was viewed as a broad, education exchange pool, as a device for letting faculty people at developing institutions pick their schools for study and to make available young teachers who could also choose developing schools at which to teach. None of that has happened! Instead, we are operating under bilateralism which has all of the problems suggested. There is, in effect, no teaching fellowship program now.

Financial Experience Provided

It has been suggested that we depart from bilateral relationships in favor of larger associations or multilateral programs. Certainly the multilateral programs are not precluded....Now, while there is nothing in the legislation that precludes making grants to an association, the advisory council recognized that the developing institution needed to gain experience in handling money, particularly when the program was designed for its development. Letting the 'big boy' always get and manage the money is part of the problem of being under-developed. This policy is now being criticized. 'Give the money to a professional association or give it to the established institution,' we are being told. To some extent, such a policy change may have the adverse side effect of perpetuating paternalism.

Benefits of Bilateralism

One weakness in bilateral programs is that we can't always receive or give help where we need it. We've spoken about the reluctance of university professors in some cases to go to the predominantly Negro colleges. There is a reluctance also on the part of the professors in the Negro colleges to receive outside help....Hampton, though small, is outstanding in certain areas, such as pre-school and elementary education. My point is that although we don't have an exchange at all levels and in all areas, we can easily spend and get benefits from the limited grant that we have on the one-to-one basis.

Examples Listed

I'd like to draw on examples of cooperation in the arts to illustrate interinstitutional patterns, both bilateral and multilateral. Seven small liberal arts colleges around Columbus, Ohio, are sharing art historians with a grant from the Kresge Foundation. None of these schools could afford an Orientalist, a Renaissance scholar, or an Egyptologist, nor could they offer specialized training in the arts. Jointly, they can do so, with the Kresge Foundation paying the gasoline mileage. The specialist works for one of the schools but teaches at all seven.

The Philadelphia College of Art, my second example, is on the verge of a cooperative arrangement with a roughly equivalent school of dance and a school of music. Each institution now has a well developed professional faculty, but all have weak academic programs. The cooperative program calls for shared academic personnel. They will jointly hire an English professor, a historian, a sociologist, and a psychologist who will move back and forth between these various art schools within the city. This arrangement will provide general education in a specialized school rather than the usual specialized education in a generalized school.

Another example is the relationship between the Boston Museum School and Tufts University. The Boston Museum School does not offer a bachelor's degree, but does provide professional courses for students enrolled at Tufts. A degree from Tufts and a certificate from the Boston Museum School are awarded.

The fourth pattern derives from research supported through an Office of Education grant to study art programs in Negro colleges. One probable recommendation will be to drop about three-fourths of the art programs in these schools. Instead of having two-man departments in ten schools, we will call for one or two very strong programs in art, a single very strong program in music, and a third school with adequate resources for the theater. Anticipated is a centralized program for a regional complex of schools.

There are obvious political problems. Each institution wants to retain its program. But in terms of strengthening the programs and enabling students to function effectively in graduate study, these four models may provide acceptable alternatives. They also provide models for patterns of interinstitutional cooperation outside the arts.

The merits and drawbacks of both types of relationships, bilateral and multilateral, will undoubtedly continue to provide lively topics for debate as colleges experiment with a variety of cooperative arrangements. In the end, both forms will probably prove essential: one-to-one pairings will certainly continue to offer effective channels for faculty and student exchanges, cultural sharings, and research projects; multilateral relationships will be a natural by-product of the increased use of electronic media. Title III funds will serve as catalysts for both types of programs which ultimately will benefit, not only the schools, but the individuals involved--students, faculty, and administrators--and refine the texture of higher education.

THE STUDENT

The maze of details that filter into exchanges between institutions must not obscure the key man in interinstitutional cooperation--the student. Basically, the success or failure of any cooperative undertaking hinges on whether or not the individual student is enriched in the process.

To understand the student's role in cooperative ventures, one must first comprehend the student experience in general. Joseph Katz presents some insights on student attitudes, based on a four-year study of corresponding classes at two eminent West Coast universities.

What emerges from his study is a picture of an educational experience that has little relevance for students. The university offers a socializing experience, instead of supplying students' needs for direction in the application of intellect to their own lives and in human relationships. Only a small minority of students, perhaps 20 percent, actually responds to the stimulation of the classroom. For many others, education is calculated in career terms or regarded as a natural step in their maturation. Everywhere the grade point average is a determining factor, serving as a kind of currency in collegiate society.

When attention is focused on the students' point of view, those at established institutions look much like those at developing schools--

the same constraints arising from tensions between student values and campus standards. Thus formulating new curricula at both developing and established institutions, educators must take into account the whole person of the student and foster creative programs to preserve his self-esteem. Educators must also consider three vital needs of today's student: autonomy, responsibility for others, and seeing the fruits of his work.

Campus demonstrations and revolts, North and South, focus attention on student activists. Doctor Katz calls these students a favored group who are able to express the frustrations of less articulate students. Intellectually committed, they are clamoring for an education that is more relevant. So far they have not provided any long range plan for reform; a democratically structured university plus sound leadership might stimulate such a broad perspective. Instead of stereotyped beatnik rebels, the activists may be the leaven that will activate fundamental change in education, away from institutional interests and toward the development of students.

In his paper, Doctor Katz points out that much of today's education has little meaning for even those students at the top of the socio-economic ladder. For those at the bottom, the so-called "disadvantaged" students, the discrepancy is even greater, especially when the racial factor is involved. For many Negro students, according to Edward W. Crosby, education becomes "an exercise in absurdity," in which they are asked to deny their "Negro-ness" and fit into a mold defined by the dominant white society.

From the perspective of the disadvantaged Negro student, the educational system presents a distorted picture of the world. Many Negro students are disillusioned with the educational myth as they witness the clash between the idealistic principles of the university and the actual practices of society. Educational norms conform to white middle class standards and simply do not apply to the Negro experience. Success for the Negro student means assimilation into this white world, rather than the evolution of his own image of himself in positive terms; implicit is the white man's assumption of Negro inferiority.

Negro colleges in the South often make the mistake of indiscriminately copying the curricula of northern schools, when they should be structuring their programs around the aptitudes and needs of their own students. Educators must recognize that students learn in different ways; students who are labeled "disadvantaged" should not be written off simply because they do not react to the intellectual stimuli used in northern universities. Instead of stressing what students do not know, educators should build on what students already know, taking into account such factors as student background, environment, and--especially--dialects. In essence, the Crosby diagnosis parallels that by Katz, the problems are common although on the surface the institutions appear very different.

What's to be done? Doctor Crosby believes that a critical analysis of the needs of the student who is not now being educated would be a beginning. The factors which create despair, alienation, ambiguity, and ambivalence must be understood; these are more fundamental than the reforms of curriculum and procedure which usually command attention in pre-college remedial programs. The college must find a way to purge itself of the view of the student as a deportment problem or of the Negro as "disadvantaged." The focus instead must be on society and its failure to live up to the principles which it asserts are its foundations. Colleges must produce graduates who are committed to expanding justice for all. Otherwise the educational experience is absurd. This assessment is squarely in the tradition of the Berkeley activist or the leaders of the sit-in movement on southern Negro campuses.

In these changes, the role of the arts should be highly relevant, for the arts are fundamentally concerned with liberating man to his fullest capacity. In his definition of the arts, Howard Conant includes "all activities and experiences which involve creative expression and value judgment development at a high level of aesthetic quality." Thus, the arts can include such disciplines as mathematics, foreign languages, and physical education as well as drama, dance, painting, and other skills usually included in this category.

Because of the universal nature of the arts, it is important that the aesthetic potential of students be developed so they can fully appreciate and use the arts which are "at once anyone's and everyone's opportunity, property, or prerogative."

Unfortunately, most elementary and secondary schools in the United States do not provide an adequate education in the arts. Sometimes neglected entirely or scheduled infrequently, the arts are often taught by well-meaning but incompetent teachers who tack art courses on to their regular class schedules. In most courses, the emphasis is on creative expression with little effort made to develop the students' critical faculties.

Balancing the scales are a number of far-reaching programs in the arts, promising to make the arts more relevant for today's students. Such developments as inter-disciplinary curricula, programs of planned heterogeneity, and interinstitutional cooperation in the arts provide a more fluid atmosphere in which the relation between the arts can be projected. The total picture which emerges from such programs helps to break down the barriers between the various arts and to place them in their proper perspective in modern world culture.

Better planning is needed also in arts projects subsidized by government and private groups. Doctor Conant observes that many of these projects are spread too thinly over a wide area to be effective. It is better to tackle a smaller area more intensively and let the cultural enrichment spread gradually to other groups.

More extensive use should be made of professional artists, critics, scholars, and other experts, especially since many of these professionals recognize the need for upgrading education in the arts. Students will benefit from direct exposure to artists as well as to original art work, good reproductions, and vicarious aesthetic experience via the electronic media. Obviously, education in the arts can benefit from an infusion of that first element in art--creativity.

From these three papers, a disturbing message emerges: that students in both the established and developing institutions are undernourished and in much the same way. If students are undernourished, the institutions themselves cannot be in a healthy state. Change in the students must be preceded by improvement in the institutions.

THE STUDENT AND INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

Joseph Katz
Institute for the Study of Human Problems
Stanford University

I can talk only about the student. In effect I can't even talk about the student--I can talk only about students at Stanford and Berkeley, whom we have studied now for some years.

As Dr. Daniel Katz has indicated, there has been very little research on the actual operations of the university, and this also includes the students. Actually, Dr. Daniel Katz in his earlier days did some work on attitudes and opinions of students, and there has been some momentum in research on students in the '50's in the work of people like Pace and Stern, Newcomb, the Harvard studies, and of course, the studies done by Sanford at Vassar during the "50's. We have since hit a phase where this is coming into greater prominence at places like the Research and Development Center in Higher Education at Berkeley, which has engaged in a series of studies of students.

I am going to talk primarily from the basis of our own work at Stanford and Berkeley which involved following the entering students of 1961 through the four years of their college careers, through repeated interviews of the same students, plus tests and questionnaires.

In the light of things we have been saying about the developing colleges, I want to submit as a thesis that it is really very hard to develop any kind of model as to what education of students might be. I think that the "Ivy League" model doesn't even fit the Ivy League students themselves. One might say that the Ivy League schools--and I'm using the words Ivy League in a very broad sense to include places like Berkeley and Stanford--do not really educate the students in the way one might expect. It does socialize them, but it does not develop them.

It does not develop them, to give only two instances, because it does not do two things that students expect, at least implictly, from an education.

One of them is the capacity of applying intellect to their own lives: students learn how to manipulate symbols and to give proper kinds of responses at examination times, but what they also very much would like to do (and you see this when they are trying to do it more spontaneously and more informally--for instance, when they form their own free universities and their experiments) is to achieve some kind of self-confrontation.

Sometimes because of their schooling they develop a certain kind of distrust of intellect. They think it simply cannot apply to personal and social problems. They sometimes tend to stress some kind of anti-rationalism. Underneath--and it's clear in the freshmen and sometimes in seniors--there is a very strong kind of a sense that intellect might really have relevance to their understanding of themselves and their society. In terms of this objective, even the so-called "best" institutions do not adequately develop their students.

The other thing that I want to single out is that the institution does not really sufficiently enable the students to live with other people. This, as the activists have shown, is a terribly important concern for students. But on the whole, to put it briefly, they are being trained to become "performing" animals. I'm using the word "performance" in both senses of the word--in the sense that they learn how to put on a good performance, and in the sense that they learn how to perform a task. These performances serve primarily individualistic purposes. What students also very much want is to be able to communicate and work together with other people and share. We have seen this, for instance, almost by accident when we studied the students who came back from Stanford overseas campuses where this kind of thing happens, where they learn to live with each other and to share both talk and other matters. This is for many of them the most important outcome of their stay abroad--not the confrontation with a foreign culture, but this social gain in the deeper sense of the word.

In this way you might say that even institutions like Berkeley and Stanford fall short. Now of course they have one kind of advantage. They have students who already have a fairly high cognitive and imaginative level of functioning. In many ways one can rely on their being able to fend for themselves in spite of some of the restrictions that the institution puts upon them.

I have had some experience recently in interviewing students at a nearby junior college. There, of course, the problem is even greater. There the students do not come with the cognitive range and with the capacity for taking some kind of distance that students at Stanford or Berkeley have. I found them very much tied to a dual kind of thing; there is a concentration on vocational preparation and also a very literal acceptance of the American dream. They really take the movie world seriously. The way in which values are presented in the movies--this is the way they see life: to live in motel-like structures, to have these bland but outwardly shiny lives, and so on. I asked a group of these junior college students how well their teachers were preparing them for the kinds of tasks they were going to confront. They told me that they find their teachers are a year behind--when transistors exist, they are still talking in terms of tubes. I raised the question of what good it would do, even if their teachers were a year ahead. I found it was difficult for us to communicate because this was somewhat of an abstract thought which was hard for them to grasp because they seemed so bound to the immediate, to the foreground. If this experience is at all typical, the task for these kinds of institutions, particularly given the kind of society that we have with its need for repeated vocational adaptation and also for emotional and cognitive flexibility, is a very hard one. We would need to raise the abstractive and imaginative levels of these students considerably. To what extent this applies to the developing institutions, I do not know, but simply want to submit it.

With this aside, I would like to come back to my main theme, which is to talk about what undergraduate institutions do not do for the students. I will also say something very soon about the activists, because I think that they express what is dormant in many students. Whenever I look through our records, particularly where there is interview knowledge, to find out what kind of students respond to the intellectual stimulation and values implied in their courses, I come out with something like a 20 percent figure. It is obviously a minority. These are the students who take excitement in the physics or philosophy or psychology courses. Many of them, of course, are headed for academic, scientific, and research careers.

Many other students, and I want to mention only two groups, have quite different orientations. A large number think of the school primarily in career terms and they see school as something they have to do in order to go into the profession they're after--medicine, the law, engineering, or whatever it might be. They regard this simply as a condition for getting to the next kind of step. Then there is also a rather large size of people who are in college primarily because this is now part of socialization, part of the kind of thing that you do. When we ask many freshmen, "Why are you here?" they look at us somewhat blankly because, of course, they take it very much for granted. It is no longer for them a live option. They do this as they go to elementary or high school, and they never really have to make much of a choice.

If I'm right, the vast majority of students are not very closely indentified with what goes on at least in the curricular side of the college. What, then, are they after as they go through college? First of all, that one thing that very much determines their behavior in college, precisely because for so many of them intrinsic motivation isn't very important, is the grade point average perspective. My former colleagues, Howard Becker the sociologist, has written a book that I hope will come out soon, devoted to this alone. He gives very careful documentation for how much the grade point average determines the thinking and behavior of students. The GPA determines access to graduate schools, to various kinds of campus offices, to the fraternities, and may even determine access to the girls, because the popular girls are accessible to the boys in the popular fraternities. At the institution studied by Becker the fraternity with the highest GPA was also the most popular. Becker used the metaphor that grades in college have somewhat the same function that money has in our own society. Private apartment houses at the University of California at Santa Barbara give students above a certain grade point average a 10 percent reduction in rent--it's literally money there. As you all know, students do calculate their grade point average to two decimal points, and they can sometimes be heard to refer to the others, "There goes a 3.2."

At the same time, students try to get some of the values that the curriculum does not encourage. They attempt very much to achieve more closeness to each other and to some extent are able to accomplish this. There's a natural process of development that helps with that and to some extent there are many kinds of facilitating factors in the university environment, although not enough. There are three other things that students want very much and that they are not getting sufficiently. The first is autonomy. The second is responsibility for others. The third is seeing the fruits of their work.

Students are very much interested in achieving independence--in their interviews with us they expressed this desire repeatedly through their four college years. But they are constantly being told to do things in terms of requirements. They verymuch want to take responsibility for others. You see this in how much they flock to the kind of opportunities that are given by tutoring programs, taking care of the mentally ill, teaching underprivileged, the Peace Corps, and so on. Whenever you open an opportunity for doing something for other people, they will take it, work very hard, and not really count the hours. At Stanford we have senior students living in freshman dorms as advisors of various sorts to the freshman students. This work comes on top of a full academic program. It can take something like 40 hours a week. When we interviewed these senior students, we raised the question (because students always complain so much about lack of time) how they had this extra time. But they no longer complained. We began to understand that it is not so much physical time as psychological time that students do not have in sufficient quantity. When time is not meaningful, it becomes burdensome to them. These same students told us that when they visited the other students who lived in the senior dorms, there seemed to be a "deadness" there. Daily involvement in meaningful tasks calling on their initiative and interests meant being alive to them, and by contrast, just going to class and studying seemed to be dead. Of course this accounts for the tremendous excitement that the student uprisings always generate at so many different institutions.

Very closely connected with the exercise of responsibility is the opportunity for seeing the fruits of one's own work. Getting good grades is a form of self-aggrandizement; at least it's something one does for oneself alone (perhaps to be displayed to parents or teachers). But students also want their work to lead to something, to have consequences in the real world beyond the comments and grades in the margins of exam papers.

I would say that in any kind of planning for the future, to provide for the better realization of these three objectives is crucial. At the end I want to say something about how this might apply to the developing colleges.

Formulations of the sort just given were arrived at by us before the outbreak of the demonstrations at Berkeley which happened in the last year of our study. But you may have recognized in what I just said some of the sort of things that the activists themselves have been expressing. As a matter of fact, some of the things that people had to get at by way of research, students have been able to express for themselves simply by becoming articulate. The need for community has been stressed by the activists, and so has the need for applying what they know to themselves and to others. The activists seem to me to be expressing things which have been latent in many students. They have been doing it by themselves; it is a rather interesting comment that reform has been coming to our institutions not from the faculty and not from the administration, but has been coming from the students.

Luckily there is a good deal of research accumulating about the activists, perhaps because they have been particularly interesting objects of study. I want briefly to call to your attention that we are dealing in the activists with a somewhat favored group; and this fact underlines the need of doing more for the other students in order to bring them some of the benefits that the activists have been finding for themselves. I'm going to summarize several results that a number of recent researches including our own are converging towards.

I call the activists a "favored" group for at least five reasons:

First, they tend to come from parents who are better educated than those of the non-activists. They tend to come from parents who accept dissent, who have in their earlier years participated directly or been sympathetic to regularly unpopular or "deviant" causes. This is interesting because, in spite of the rebelliousness that the activists have exhibited and in spite of their saying that nobody beyond 30 is to be trusted, they are really talking from a base of shared values with their parents.

Second, the activist students turn out to be significantly higher on verbal aptitude, not in mathematical aptitude. Third, they turn out to be significantly higher on cumulative grade point average or other kinds of measures of performance. Fourth, they turn out higher on personality scales. We have been using scales like the social maturity scale which measures the degree of autonomy, flexibility, tolerance of ambiguity, and such nice things. The activists score significantly higher as freshmen in our samples. They score higher as seniors in our own sample and in several samples studied by the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Berkeley. It will be no surprise to you that they also score significantly higher on impulse expression.

Fifth, and this may amuse some of you, they have more contact with their teachers and they describe themselves as learning very much more from their courses than the other students do. I think this can be interpreted in this way: they are the intellectually more committed students, they take the university seriously and simply want more of it. Very interestingly, they have partially been stimulated by the university to become activists. There are teachers who are themselves semi-activists, teachers with activist sympathies, teachers who are more dissentient. You might say the university is creating its own grave diggers; to some extent, the university has been training this kind of dissent. Even though the activists have the psychological disposition for dissent, as the personality scales indicate, it probably still needed the releasing factor of the university influence.

But one thing that I almost predicted about a year or two ago has not happened, or at least not yet. It seemed likely in 1965 that the student movement might develop a long range plan for the future, anticipating that it would take time, thought, and strategy to reform the university or reform the curriculum. This has not been happening and there are reasons for that.

One of them is that the activist ideology implies a distrust of organizations and a very strong commitment to not being sucked into the, including movements like the Free Speech Movement itself. The activists we interviewed would tell us that they could only tolerate being part of the FSM because they knew it was temporary; if they were going to stay in it long they knew it would mean some kind of oranizational bondage.

To some extent, I think this has made the task of administrators and faculty harder because they may have to do more for the students than seemed likely. It might have been better if the students had done more for themselves and pressed us harder. But if they are not going to, we may have to use a sort of psychological Keynesianism and so some pump priming. That is why I'm very much with Dr. Daniel Katz when he talked about a more democratic restructuring of the university, involving the students more in the decision-making processes of the university. And for those of you who are not acquainted with an actual college model, I would like to refer you to Antioch College which has shown one way in which this might be done.

The one thing I would like to add to this support of democratic restructuring is stressing that we are still in need of leadership. The problem with democracy alone is that the debate and the decisions might revolve around shallow definitions of the issues. Good leadership consists in the capacity of grasping what people intend beyond the surface. (Here research can help to articulate things that students and others do not fully articulate for themselves.) To give you one instance out of many: Recently a fraternity was temporarily suspended at Stanford and their house became free. The students immediately grabbed the opportunity and said: Let's use that vacant fraternity house for an educational experiment. What they were thinking of was getting lots of different people together--men, women, undergraduates, graduate students, faculty--and having them move into the same house and establish some kind of living-learning arrangement. When they came to me and talked to me about this, I asked them: Is this enough--what else will you do? You will live together, but how are you going to spend your time? Such things students are not likely to articulate in the necessary detail unless some kind of leadership is provided. The alternative may be disappointment. If you let them room together, they will find this doesn't do the trick. Some of the experiments that the students are doing in their free universities have a tendency to fizz out because there's not a long range perspective. There is a magical belief that just by losing some of the structure of official college courses, productive learning will result.

I hasten to add that leadership should be offered, not coerced. I would rather have students make mistakes and ask for leadership themselves next time, than force it upon them prematurely--something that good leaders are not likely to do anyway. We have given the students insufficient opportunity to exercise responsibility. There is too much fear of student impulses in the adult world, including the administrative world. Whenever we have investigated the students' controls of their impulses, we have found them to be very good--and this sometimes under conditions that almost call for "acting out" against us, because one way of getting people to misbehave is to expect it of them, as we sometimes do of students.

I want to conclude with a moral. I have stressed many constraints operating upon students that keep them from attaining objectives which are terribly important to them. This is difficult even for students who are in a very favorable position because of their imaginativeness, their flexible character structures, their high abilities, their assurance of a place in the sun of American society. One might expect that these problems might be stronger for people in the developing colleges because they have additional demands made upon them--demands, for instance, of following a distant Ivy League type of curriculum, of adapting to middle class values and middle class skills, and also, very importantly, psychological demands due to mobility. We find that students who come from a different social class than most Berkeley or Stanford students experience conflict between the new values and expectations of the college environment and those of their own family and background. The movement to a different set of values and of behavior, of advancing beyond one's father, really results in terrific tensions. Even the father of us all, Sigmund Freud, fainted on the Acropolis when he realized he had achieved an ambition not granted to his father.

Even parental support of the upward move may not necessarily eliminate conflict, but give rise to a different one. The child is propelled by a parent or parents who want their children to have it better than they did. The child may feel obliged to do well by his parents, but this docility has its own kind of psychological problems because it also can create resentment.

These then may be added problems for students in the developing institutions--and hence there may be need for detailed psychological explorations. Whatever else we do, it is terribly important that in his passage through the educational world the student's self-esteem gets preserved in the greatest possible way. For that reason, I want to make just one last suggestion. Sometimes, if we really want to educate students toward some of the intellectual and technological skills and values that we are talking about, we might be better off doing it in a roundabout way. Thus, we might teach students psychology better if we connected their academic course to their working with other people and doing something for them. We might, in particular, serve better the purposes of cognitive development of students in the developing colleges by giving them much opportunity to be of service to others, and be in helping, caretaking, "in charge" roles as they are going through college. Sometimes the way to cognitive skills is seemingly indirect and attention to personality may be a necessary condition of achieving some of the curricular objectives that we are posing for ourselves.

THE NEGRO AND EDUCATION: AN EXERCISE IN ABSURDITY

Edward W. Crosby
Director of Curriculum and Teacher-Counselors
Southern Illinois University

One of the major problems in our society today stems from the tragic waste of human potential among the youth of the ghettos of large cities and other depressed areas of the country. There is presently an increasing number of so-called "underprivileged" youngsters who find that they must daily face the world with little hope of ever participating productively in the maintenance of their society. The overall situation described above contributes to the development of a much more complex problem. Perhaps the most serious of the problems posed for these urban youth is their relegation to a humiliating dependence, now and increasingly, upon the welfare arms of the society. This dependence is cruel and wasteful both for the society at large (in terms of the enormous neglect of human resources) and for the young individuals themselves upon whom this dependence has such a debilitating psychological impact; we can no longer afford to ignore such a large segment of the population, allowing it to perpetuate itself in despair and hopelessness, for in the long run, the unattended problem of human waste will set plague and havoc to the healthy maintenance of a democratic society.[1]

Although this paper will restrict itself to a discussion of the problem as it concerns Negroes involved in the educational processes of the nation's public high schools and institutions of higher learning, it must also be kept in mind that regardless of race, all those classified as "underprivileged" or "culturally deprived" are faced with a similar problem. If there is a difference, it is primarily one of magnitude.

Negro youth confronted with the American educational system are asked to accept an extremely distorted image of the world they have grown up regarding to be real: the black ghetto world of slums, abject poverty, vermin, and no immediate opportunity to escape. As a student, from kindergarten to college, the Negro is expected to involve himself psychologically, culturally, and socially in an enterprise designed, supposedly, for the purpose of broadening his horizons and giving him intellectual vantage points for assaying the world. Between the years five to, say, twenty-one, the Negro student is led, as it were, from one learning plateau to the next; he gradually progresses from the disturbingly funny readers of Dr. Seuss to the equally disturbing seriousness of Erich Fromm's Sane Society or Paul Goodman's Growing Up Absurd. If the student is lucky, he will have the chance in his early years to learn to read from readers that picture Negro and white children playing together -- the word Negro is, however, mysteriously excluded from the text.[2] In school the student is given the tools which should unshackle his mind and provide him with the mental agility to overcome the numerous hurdles thrown in his path by an unyielding society which, so far as he is concerned, has been founded on race prejudice, irrationalism, and myopia. His odyessey carries him into a vastly different and cold climate, into a white world where he is conspicuously unimportant and therefore excluded and forgotten.

In order to see more clearly what the distortion consists of, we need only look at the future college student in his high school where he encounters for days on end similarly confined classmates who talk as he does, who, in social matters at least, think along lines similar to his, and who finally return home at the end of each school day to a situation that parallels his own. The subjects he is taught in school are not made relevant to his ghetto environment; and his teachers, embarrassed by, or ignorant of these facts, are constrained to avoid drawing relationships that would enable the student to perceive both the dissimilarities and the relevance of that taught to his daily experience. In an elementary school, a teacher refrained from reading Tom Sawyer to her class because she feared the characted nigger Jim would embarrass her Negro pupils.

Vernon F. Haubrich in his article, "Teachers for Big-City Schools" writes the following:

> Recently, a student teacher was attempting to show the patterns of immigration to the United States. She listed the Irish, the Germans, the Italians, the English, and the Scandinavians; she also indicated through class discussion the contributions these groups had made. Even

> though the class was entirely made up of Negro and Puerto Rican children, she made no mention of Negro or Puerto Rican immigration, in-migration, or contributions. When asked why this was so, she indicated she did not know about these things, for they were not part of her college work or her own reading![3]

The teacher's efforts to motivate the youngster to learn are also vitiated by his failure to realize the force of the ghetto dynamic that determines, however subtly, what is worth learning and who should teach it. Life in the ghetto is a serious matter and cannot be taken lightly by those forced to remain within its confines. The recently published report of the Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc., describes one aspect of the dynamic in these terms: "Too many of these young people express their sense of personal defeat through stagnation, despair, and flirtation with narcotics as a means of developing social patterns of compensatory status which are compatible with the ghetto modes."[4]

What is true of the secondary schools is also found to be so in many of the nation's colleges and universities, for here, too, the same basic orientation to what is of value to the general education of Negro Americans remains and, indeed, becomes even more grotesque. The impact of being left out and of being made aware of how small and therefore how meaningless the Negro contribution to the realization of the "American Dream" has been has had a powerfully alienating effect upon Negro students and parents, both those parents who no longer have school age youngsters and those who have been able to maintain for themselves and their children a faint belief in education as an effective release from the misery and despair of utter hopelessness.

Both types of parents share in the general distrust of the overtures of change based on the degree to which Negroes become educated and are able to be assimilated into the American mainstream; and no matter how hard they attempt to keep their suspicions from the young, they cannot, and the youngsters attend school not out of a desire to learn but because they legally must. They are forced to ingest irrelevant material without allowing themselves to make explicit any critical notions concerning a system that wants them to deny their Negro-ness and become an anomalous something that can be included in the operation of the culture. Consequently, they revolt implicitly against the establishment's authority figure, the teacher, who fails to understand what is developing in the classroom. Discipline problems are brought into line in the principal's office or by the juvenile authorities, never by revamping the course of study to meet their needs, never by showing the students the importance of the skills learned for bettering their lives as Negroes in the American crucible. Instead the students are instructed to conform to the value system of others which, at bottom, again suggests to them their inferiority.

> Vernon Haubrich suggests that the world of the teacher (middle-class or middle-class striving) and the world of the child (lower-class) represents a problem with several dimensions. Much has been said of lower-class children faced with the middle-class teacher and school. Most of what is said is reliable and valid.

> Children who have meager educational backgrounds, who, for a wide variety of reasons, are ambivalent towards the work of the school, who see little to aim for in a society which discriminates against them, who use language which is more "colorful" and who may rebel more often than other children in other areas, are in somewhat of a conflict with the teacher who has achieved a measure of success and wishes to convey the skills and ambitions she "knows" and has learned. And, of course, there's the rub.
>
> Taking examinations, filling out forms, going to libraries, valuing the competitive life, striving to get ahead, and wanting what success the middle class wants are part of the outlook of most of our teachers. In a realistic sense, many teachers and students in this kind of a situation are talking past one another. They live in different worlds.[5]

The schools, then, become immense daytime prisons devoted not to educating but rather to fitting each Negro student into a predetermined mold of behavior.[6] Of those students who do not engage in a complete renunciation of the desire to attend school no mention is made, even though these students are most in need of help, since they are more easily made victims of the system then the cynics who refuse to be absorbed and "shaped" by the educational processes. Later these "good" students much to their chagrin find out that their willingness to achieve was for naught and begin to suspect and then to believe that much of what they have learned has not been relevant to their situation and runs contrary to what they now know to be reality. The problem manifests itself, therefore, in even greater dimensions and includes the culturally disadvantaged as well as the advantaged youth who has enjoyed a more definite and less frustrating experience. This advantaged student has tried to find relevance for his high school studies and for the most part continues to figure college into his general scheme of things; and both his parents might be college graduates and therefore more economically secure and educationally optimistic. Their sons or daughters are, almost congenitally, imbued with a dangerous if not perverse attitude toward Negro education for "the Good Life."

These are the students sent by middle class progress-oriented parents to the private schools for knowledge not readily obtainable in the inferior public high schools of the North and South. The recent pressures brought to bear upon the general community by the various civil rights and political action groups have contributed greatly to the speed with which these students witness the destruction of an ideal. Thus, the Negro student, "advantaged" or otherwise, tends to view himself at the end of his high school career in an unreal, purposeless situation, condemned both to better himself through the appropriate educational channels and to realize that just because he is Negro his concerted efforts to belong are not rewarded and his frustration increased; hence, the more the student learns, the greater his chances are of seeing the distortion from another perspective than his less privileged counterpart who refuses a formal education all together.

What is devastating here is the ambivalence, for the student has actually never stopped hoping that the not-too-frequent advice of hopeful parents and a few well-meaning teachers and guidance counselors will prove to be correct. The high school diploma will enable him, he cannot help but feel, to become a more effective part of the society. But, what society? The only real society and possibilities are those he sees around him, and he does not need a high school education for that. Life in his world demands an education in the society of the ghetto and how best to operate within it. His heroes range from pimps, numbers men, junkies and skilled shoplifters to ministers, lawyers, and doctors; all of them rigidly bound together in seeking methods of effecting an escape from the ghetto vise; with them he can identify. School does not provide a ready made escape hatch from this existence. Therefore, to study life outside the ghetto is, it appears, to dream, and dreams destroy the dreamer.

Of course, school has definitely opened some windows through which the student has been exposed to a world of unlimited opportunity. The truth is, however, that all of this world is fast being considered beyond his purview and useless. On the street he meets other Negroes who have been fortunate enough to find their way through the educational system, but unfortunate they remain, since the education received is faulty and cannot be translated into terms of relatedness to the Negro experience. Peter Countryman, of the Northern Student Movement, suggests rather pointedly that "the form of education under which these students must live, through the fault of no one person and yet through the fault of the entire American population, systematically discriminates against them, limiting their vision of human existence, narrowing their choice of what they will become, depriving them of the very pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness which is sacred to the American society. It is this fact that ultimately must be changed."[7]

The ambiguity, vividly operative in the conscious or subconscious mental fabric, persists in spite of the ever increasing amount of evidence brought to show that the contrary is becoming more and more true; that is, what were once the typical limits to the level of aspirations for Negroes no longer holds validity. According to Martin Deutsch, "it is in the school situation that the highly charged negative attitudes toward learning evolve, and the responsibility for such large groups of normal children showing great scholastic retardation, the high dropout rate, and to some extent the delinquency problem, must rest with the failure of the school to promote the proper acculturation of these children."[8] In sharp contrast to Deutsch's observation is the fact that education has paradoxically become a shibboleth, and the more education, the better. The Negro student is caught up in this situation even though he may doubt the efficacy of education as presently constituted and proffered him as essential to his future well-being. Critical examination tells him that somewhere the system has failed, for how can an effective system organized to produce sensitivity to social injustice and to ethical principles, produce just the opposite on so large a scale? If the educated man is recognized, as Kenneth Clark states, "by his independence of thought, his capacity to feel the needs of his fellow man, and his passionate and courageous insistence upon the primacy of truth and justice in human relations,"[9] then the Negro has great reason to be skeptical of the American educational system, for he has always been the victim of the lack of passion and courage on the part of those who have been "educated" for justice in human relations.

As mentioned, in college the situation tends to remain the same, especially in small private liberal arts colleges, where tuition is high and the students are for the most part from homogeneous familial and economic backgrounds, i.e., they all are oriented toward middle class values centered around achievement and upward mobility. The larger colleges are also involved in helping to perpetuate a distorted picture of what education really means and what is educationally valuable and relevant for their white students, no less. Edward J. Gordon, Director of Yale's Master of Arts in Teaching Program, suggests that the "teacher and the student live in a world mad with dichotomies . . . The student operates in a world in which he is asked to accept two opposing sets of values; one that is in theory taught in the books he reads and the one which is operative in the school and in the society which makes up his larger world. He is caught between what he is expected to believe and what the world rewards as beliefs."[10] The unrest presently found among white college students provides incontrovertible testimony that schools and colleges throughout the nation now have to face up to their failure and their need to rethink educational objectives with the students in mind, for the time has passed when students are able to follow blindly the dictates of their elders in matters which concern them and the world they would like to live in.

For the Negro college student the same situation obtains, if not for the same reasons at least the similarities are obvious; and he has no choice other than that of using the system to his best advantage and to disregard the irrelevant matters that badger him into following a course that leads him away from himself, that makes him deny his inherent worth and accept values imposed from without. How often does a Negro hear ad absurdum the words human dignity, opportunity, freedom, equality, and democracy and come to see that they have meaning for him only when equated with the dignity, opportunities, freedom, and equality of his white fellow citizens. In order to have dignity, the Negro must look outside himself to find a measure; his equality of opportunity is equated in terms of how closely he can approximate the American way. This point is made more evident in the following assessment by Charles E. Silberman: "Some people see the Negro problem as purely legal and social and assume that it will be solved automatically by desegregating schools, restaurants, bus terminals, and housing developments. Other people see it as purely economic, to be resolved by upgrading Negro jobs and incomes. And a good many Americans believe the problem would be solved if the Negroes would just decide to adopt white middle class standards of behavior and white middle class goals of economic success." Tacit in each of the three proposed solutions to the "Negro Problem" is the assumption that white middle class America is the sole guardian of the ingredients that go into making human worth; and because of this assumption the Negro is told that his self-respect depends on the ability of others to decide when he has earned the right to be self-respecting. Seldom, if ever, is he allowed to entertain the thought that he alone is responsible for developing his own sense of self, for building an image of who he is: "It is a day-to-day struggle of structuring and clarifying the reality of group procedures and of verbal concepts and of the teacher's feelings for me: me the Negro child, almost always preached at in school by people who cared only for a better, different "me" -- not for what I really am."[12]

School systems and colleges have traditionally been reluctant to allow freedom in this area: the values of the American middle class, though constantly being projected to all those who come under the system's tutelege, never "take" psychologically with Negro youngsters because they merely reinforce the students' perception of the discrepancy between what is told to them and what actually is. Within this process, Negro students are victimized and coerced into accommodating themselves to values that hold no meaning and with which they cannot identify. Edward J. Gordon goes on to maintain that "no one can value anything until he values himself. And the only way to get a student to value himself is to give him a sense of accomplishment, an idea that something he has said or done is worthwhile. We then build his sense of self-respect."[13]

Why go to school and then to college at all if the experience does not enhance the concept of self-esteem and confidence in the capacity to think independently and to arrive at conclusions based on one's own interpretation of the material taught? Why continue to submit oneself to an educational process intent on instilling in the learner a feeling of guilt for not sharing in the mores of the society at large? These are some of the questions that American colleges and universities must answer if they expect to eradicate the stigma of inferiority from the subconsciousness of Negro students. It need not be stressed here that the answers to the problem are not easily found. Miseducation has been allowed to run rampant; teachers in the lower schools, where the demand for keen awareness of the problem is acute, are not capable by virtue of lack of vision and preparation to cope with the situation as it presents itself in their classroom; in college it is imagined that the problem is all but nonexistent. "The problems and challenges of the culturally depressed areas will not be solved unless there is a basic change in the education, housing, and employment patterns which pervade the entire life of the people in these areas. Of the three factors, education, housing, and employment, we view education as crucially important; for until the school provides these children with the necessary skills and understandings needed to compete successfully in our interdependent, industrial society, the fundamental situation will not change."[14]

One of the most enlightening experiences which this writer has had occurred in the South in an all Negro college. The students could all be described as culturally deprived and in dire need of raising the level of their aspirations, and it behooved the institution to give them the educational wherewithal for becoming productive members of their society. The curriculum of this Negro college was comparable (and undoubtedly still is) to the courses of study pursued across the country, and so were the teaching methods. Herein lay the basic problem, for this student body demanded special and compensatory attention. English was taught not as a means of verbal and written communication but rather to show the students that their speech habits were not acceptable and, what is more, lacked any expressive value. What was at issue here was the inability of the instructors to recognize that students learn best when they are approached with an understanding of the students' educational problems and an appreciation for the environment from which they come. Moreover, they learn best when they are given to realize that their particular dialect is at best highly creative and capable of expressing ideas just as well as the standard language. "It is for teachers . . . to decide how best to put across language. Indeed, it is they who must determine if that kind of motivation is actually what is needed. But it would seem worthwhile to explore the notion of acquiring important new ways of talking in addition to the old ways, rather than instead of them.[15] Unfortunately, the procedure used in the classrooms of this college did not take advantage of what the student already knew for the purposes of educating him to alternative modes of speech and standard codes of written expression; and because of this the students were made to feel that they had nothing to say of any import, and even if they did, they would not say it in the right way. Therefore, they clammed up and became passive listeners and despaired of any attempts to force themselves, in order not to appear stupid, to learn grammatical exactness and correct pronunciation.

Frank Riessman in Cultural Styles of the Disadvantaged sets forth the notion that there is a dichotomy of styles operative between the disadvantaged and the schools. He sees this dichotomy as two separate learning cultures, one promoted by schools, colleges and universities and the other indigenous to Riessman, "rewards certain styles." Riessman continues by stressing that "currently in educational circles two apparently different emphases are counterposed: the stress on excellence and the stress on democracy. One reflection of the latter is the interest in providing education for large numbers of un-advantaged children. Basically, what is opposed here is lower class (democracy) vs. middle class (talent). What is overlooked in the argument is the talent in the low income groups, not only because there are a good many more people in these strata, but because there are learning styles among the low income groups that represent unique, untapped sources of creativity for the United States."[16]

This is precisely the problem that confronted the instructors of those underprivileged, southern Negro college youngsters. For the instructors themselves were too intent on making them conform to middle class standards, they were looking for "talent" at the expense of those students whose talent was cloaked in a different cultural and mental style. Some characteristics of this style according to Riessman are:

(1) Physical and visual rather than aural;

(2) Content-centered rather than form-centered;

(3) Externally oriented rather than introspective;

(4) Problem-centered rather than abstract-centered;

(5) Inductive rather than deductive;

(6) Spatial rather than temporal;

(7) Slow, careful, patient, perservering (in areas of importance) rather than clever, facile, quick;

(8) Game and action vs. test;

(9) One-track thinking and unorthodox learning rather than other-directed flexibility;

(10) Expressive vs. instrumental orientation;

(11) Words in relation to action rather than word-bound (inventive word power and "hip" language).

The above list is by no means exhaustive nor is it entirely correct. It, nevertheless, points to an area of educational concern, for the disadvantaged high school or college youth is oftentimes classified as a slow learner simply because of his inability to respond to instructional stimuli which are meaningless to him. Mrs. Muriel Crosby, President-Elect of the National Council of Teachers of English, recently observed that English teachers will continue to fail in teaching reading and writing unless they begin by utilizing the nonstandard version of the language which the students are used to speaking at home and in the streets; otherwise, the teacher will find that he cannot communicate the values of using the more formal language. It follows, therefore, that the other characteristics of the learning style of disadvantaged Negro youth can be made use of to create an atmosphere in which these youth can find relevance and consequently be motivated to move on to even higher aspirations and to make adjustments in their value structure.

The use of standard English and the ability to read and understand are essential attributes of the educated. What one reads and the value he places on the content becomes significant only when he is allowed to exercise independent thought in interpreting the work read. Like the English courses taught at the Negro college, however, students in the humanities were subjected to the same myopic approach. While in the South, I remember sitting in a session where a student was giving a report on Marlow's _Faust_ and constantly found herself interrupted by the instructor who took offense at the student's failure to have subject and verb agree. True, in college there should not be the necessity to spend so much time on simple mechanics, and an instructor becomes impatient with a student who apparently sluffs off the basics; but that is the challenge presented to colleges which have in attendance primarily the underprivileged. Essential to this challenge is to maintain self-respect and to engender the desire to articulate impressions gained in any course of study. Continuous interruptions while giving a report merely because a verb does not agree or a word is mispronounced builds conversely a hostility toward the subject (or the instructor) and an unwillingness to continue the exercise. The watchwords of schools engaged in educating students from deprived backgrounds must be self-respect, success, and understanding.

The above does not mean to imply that this college does not recognize the need for "special" treatment. In fact, the college had for some time been attuned to the inabilities of its students and had developed a pre-college summer program in those subjects it considered vital to its overall program: English, speech, mathematics, reading, etc. In theory, therefore, an attempt to ameliorate the educational problems of the underprivileged was made; in practice, however, the students themselves were to accept the blame for being substandard, for they were placed in "remedial" sections which immediately suggested to them that they were to undergo a crash program designed to bring them to a more desirable level, as if their learning potential depended entirely upon these summer courses.

Missing from the philosophy of the pre-college program was the need to preserve the students' sense of self-respect, to provide a measure of success, and/or to make use of their different learning styles as educational points of departure. Special programs for the culturally deprived are very important, but, as demonstrated, programs alone are not enough. Moreover, how much strict attention must be paid to the demands of this special situation cannot be immediately ascertained. The important point here is that new, imaginative, and creative methods for reaching these students must be introduced. The old method of finding out what the students do not know has not worked, and, in fact, it precludes all the educational possibilities that could be obtained by meeting the student on his level and using what he does know as a springboard to further learning.

In the North the problem is not so clearly defined, for the assumption is that Negro students who manage to find their way into colleges and universities have already conquered their problems and are therefore amenable to being shaped by the school culture. Indeed, this is undoubtedly true of an ever increasing number of students who come from home situations which are effective in combating the native cynicism of the ghetto; but, as suggested above, the fact that the youngsters gladly appear on college campuses across the nation does not mean that they have been successful in removing or bringing into sharper focus their blurred image of the world and will subsequently come to find relevance in the total college experience.

Informal conversations with some Negro students have shown that many attended college because of parental pressures and not out of a desire to learn. This writer has had a very capable student admit to him that she went to an interracial college to prove to herself and to the white world that she was more than just a Negro and could become an active, intelligent member of the society on whatever level she _chose_ to perform. One of the most naive reasons, on the surface at least, for choosing a particular college was in part based upon the number of Negroes in attendance, as if that were the most important factor contributing to a relevant college experience.

Moreover, many of the students spoken to attended interracial northern colleges in order to escape from an untenable position foisted upon them by the rigid strictures of ghetto life. It did not take overly long for disenchantment to set in and force these students to seek escape in the opposite direction. Another student complained about his disillusionment with the educational myth which guided his college's endeavor to realize its objectives. For him it was the very essence of absurdity to have a professor apologize for having to discuss Negroes in his presence or to have administration officials who must call white parents for permission to assign Negro roommates.

College to these students is an artificial and idealistic creation intent on instilling in all students an appreciation of learning and the values held by the greater culture. We need not become more involved here with a complete evaluation of this position and its shortcomings than to point out that this position does not recognize, because of its short-sightedness, the existence of a very serious problem, and the analysis of the problem and its solution must not be restricted to Negro college students alone but must be attempted on a much broader scale and, therefore, include the total college experience in America. The Negro student, however, does provide an extremely interesting focal point, for nowhere else can the incongruities of our society be more clearly defined and administered to.

The problem is that of making college education relevant. Kenneth Clark suggests the following either/or proposition for America's colleges, North and South:

> Once a student enters college, he can be given an efficient standardized, mass-produced education that makes minimum demands upon him as a thinking, feeling person--he can be put upon the road to the type of unidimensional success which can be measured by income and position, or the college experience can be the tortuous, turbulent, challenging search for ethical and intellectual meaning of the human predicament.
>
> The one direction leads to the continuation of the non-controversial, business-as-usual pattern of American education, and to that vague sense of personal ambiguity that psychiatric counselors find so prevalent in our college students. The other direction might lead to a sense of purpose, personal fulfillment, and the possibility of significant contributions to a society in desperate need of crucial and compassionate analysis and solutions. We must hope that our colleges have not so long defaulted that our society must look elsewhere for this help if it is to be saved.[18]

This is the problem currently facing colleges whether they recognize it as a problem or not; and it is a problem that the astute white students of interracial colleges are addressing themselves to in one way or another. Negro students, on the other hand, are confronted with a more ambivalent situation. They enter college with grave misgivings and fear of failure, with the personal need to succeed, and with the anxieties concomitant with a feeling of not belonging, and discover in time that, except for the promise of future earning power, college for them is a "soulless" and "valueless" thing.

What should be done to make college education change its misguided direction is very difficult to prescribe because of the remedy's immensity. Nonetheless, as mentioned earlier in these pages, a critical analysis of the needs and educational difficulties that harass underprivileged youngsters is an excellent place to start, for here all the traditional educational procedures of the past have resulted in failures and have drastically retarded the progress of the entire enterprise. It is this observer's conviction that programs similar to that instituted by the Negro college mentioned above are essential; however, we must not make the same mistakes. We must develop a sound program carefully designed to allow the student to begin to pursue a college education as a stepping stone to even greater heights of ultimate concern for himself and his fellow man. What I am advocating here is that colleges undertake a Head Start Program for Underprivileged College Students, and the program should, perhaps, begin as early as the students' sophomore year in high school and continue until they enter college or until they demonstrate the ability to carry on alone.

It must be pointed out here that it is beyond the scope of this paper to submit a rationale for programs that are best able to alleviate one of our nation's most pressing problems. The primary purpose here is to make manifest as many of those factors as possible which inhibit the complete involvement of those students who have systematically been denied the opportunity to achieve in their society. Many of the causal factors were enumerated above: despair, alienation, ambiguity, and ambivalence, all of which prevent an adequate adjustment to the requirements of a college education. Furthermore, any effective special program demands that we cease and resist further reference to the "pathology" of the Negro. The Negro and other deprived members of society are not outsiders because they want to be, but because they are forced into that condition by the society which restricts their movement. And any program to ameliorate their situation has to begin with first things first, and that means they must begin with the failure of American society to live up to its principles of Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness.

Consequently, a thorough examination of the society and its educational institutions ought to be undertaken seriously, for here unfortunately everything that is undesirable in America is bred and nourished. And it is here that the Negro student finally sees that there might be for him no way out. Kenneth Clark, in an address to the ACAC Nineteenth

National Conference on Admission to College, reports that, despite the evidence that shows that the Negro is economically better off as a result of having attended college, 80 percent of those Negroes graduated from the North's interracial colleges were not "by any means as involved in, or committed to action for interracial justice as were their less privileged and woefully less academically prepared brothers and sisters in the segregated, Negro college of the South."[19] This fact is disturbing because it underlines what has already been said with reference to the entire educational process, for its stated objectives are decimated by its inability to preserve in the minds and spirits of the young any vestige of concern for the human condition.

It is also disturbing to witness the process of indifference and eventual dehumanization that seeps into the moral fiber of Negro college students intent on finding answers to problems and the means for preventing a recurrence of the same problems. As argued earlier, the recent strident demands for civil rights tends to offset this lack of involvement among Negro colleges, but the change in the perfunctory interest in social and political matters of these students was not caused by the colleges themselves but rather in spite of them. This in-spite-of, along with all of the failures I mentioned previously, is what makes the exercise so absurd: *Go to school in order not to learn the meaning of life, in order to become disengaged and indifferent to the inconsistencies of the American myth which perpetuates an ideal and therefore distorted view of* *reality for all those inappropriately instructed students, Negro and white, who are incapable of challenging it in the school situation.*

The obvious conclusion is that something be done immediately to rectify the educational enterprise on all levels, for it literally destroys life for both the advantaged and the disadvantaged. We can only hope that it is not already too late.

NOTES

1. From an unpublished paper, "An Alternative to the Hopelessness and Despair Fostered by the Ghetto," written by E. Crosby, D. Henderson, and G. Piper, dated 1964. This paper later became a proposal for the establishment of a Tutoral Program in Akron, Ohio, which program was funded by O.E.O. in June 1965.

2. Larrick, Nancy, "The All-White World of Children"s Books," *The Saturday Review*, September 1, 1965, pp. 63-65, 84-85.

3. Haubrich, Vernon F., "Teachers For Big-City Schools" in Passow (ed.), *Education in Depressed Areas*, New York, 1965, p. 247.

4. *Youth in the Ghetto: A Study of the Consequences of Powerlessness and a Blueprint for Change. A Summary*, HARYOU: New York, 1964, p. 1.

5. Haubrich, *Op.Cit.*, p. 245.

6. See Paul Goodman's *Compulsory Mis-Education* (New York, 1964) for a discussion of what this means for all students.

7. "The Philadelphia Experiment," pamphlet publication by the Northern Student Movement: New Haven, Connecticut, fall 1962, p. 2.

8. "The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Process," in Passow (ed.), *Education in Depressed Areas*, p. 39. (emphasis added.)

9. "The Negro College Student: Some Facts and Some Concerns," reprint of an article in the *Journal of the Association of College Admissions Counselors*, Winter, 1964.

10. "The Secondary Schools and Their Students' Values," in the *Yale Undergraduate*, Yale University: New Haven, Connecticut, Spring, 1964, p. 3.

11. "The City and The Negro," *Fortune*, 1962.

12. Kornberg, Leonard, "Teachers for Depressed Areas," in Passow (ed.), *Education in Depressed Areas*.

13. Gordon, Loc. Cit.

14. Haubrich, Op. Cit., pp. 248-249

15. From an unpublished District of Columbia Urban Language Study conducted by Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C., (August, 1965). See also William A. Steward, "Urban Negro Speech: Socio-Linguistic Factors Affecting English Teaching" in Roger Shuy, ed., Social Dialects and Language Learning. Champaign, Illinois. National Council of Teachers of English, 1965.

16. Pamphlet publication by the Northern Student Movement: New Haven, Connecticut.

17. Riessman, Frank, The Culturally Deprived Child, New York, 1962, pp. 70-80.

18. Clark, Loc. Cit.

19. Clark, Loc. Cit.

THE ROLE OF THE ARTS IN EDUCATION

Howard Conant
Chairman, Department of Art Education
Head, Division of Creative Arts
Chairman of the New York University Art Collection
New York University

Any statement concerning the arts in education must be based on a clear understanding that the arts include all activities and experiences which involve creative expression and value judgment development at a high level of aesthetic quality. Expressions like "the arts and humanities," "creative expression in art," and "the aesthetics of art," are not only redundant but reflect an unawareness of the meaning of the arts. Whether expressive activity or study (in painting, sculpture, crafts, music, dance, literature, architecture, or even mathematics, physical education, social studies, and foreign languages) is or is not art depends upon the level of aesthetic quality.

This level of quality, sometimes called aesthetic excellence, separates art from expressive activities and studies which, though seemingly "artistic," are essentially unaesthetic or nonaesthetic in their quality of expressiveness or content. Either an expressive activity or the content of an academic discipline is art or it is not art. There is no "middle ground" in art.

According to the eminent French art historian, Henri Focillon, "Art is art, and only as such can it be studied." The same may be said of creative expression in any field. Paraphrasing Focillon, "Creative expression in any discipline (at a high level of aesthetic quality) is art, and only as an art should it be evaluated."

No single person, discipline, subject, or expressive activity has exclusive rights to the arts. The arts are anyone's and everyone's opportunity, property, or prerogative. The only restriction which should be placed upon expressive activity or study is that if it is to be called art, it must be art. More specifically, the practice or study of any discipline or subject which calls itself art must be characterized by aesthetic excellence.

The meaning of art may be understood by study of the work of outstanding professional artists and also by study of the expressive activity of young children (provided their expressiveness has not been spoiled by interference from inept adults, including teachers of art and other subjects, or from siblings, peers, the mass media, and the generally unaesthetic environment in which they live). Another way to develop understanding of the arts is to study the value judgment expressions concerning the arts made by young children as well as by artists, critics, and historians. Finally, direct personal involvement in art activities is integral to the development of an understanding of the meaning of art.

CURRENT PRACTICES IN ART EDUCATION

On a purely statistical basis, confirmed by the writer's professional experiences, an analysis of literature in the related art fields, and on the role of government in those fields, it is obvious that most American elementary and secondary school pupils are:

1. not provided with adequate opportunity for significant expressive, and, particularly, subject matter (art history and criticism) learning experiences in the arts;

2. being given slightly more opportunity for expressive and subject matter learning experiences in the arts of literature, music, and the crafts than they are receiving in the arts of architecture, environmental design, dance, drawing, painting, photography, printmaking, and sculpture;

3. at the elementary school level, being "taught" the arts by self-contained classroom teachers whose ability to teach these subjects (with the possible exception of literature) is either severely limited, wrongly directed, or non-existent.

Usually, those arts which classroom teachers do their best to teach are those in which they have developed limited proficiency through trying to meet the clearly felt need of their pupils. Their limited proficiency is usually developed by one or more of the following means: daily classroom experience; inservice workshops, some led by demonstrators from art material firms who place undue stress upon media manufactured by their own company and who conversely under-emphasize the study of the subject matter of art because it consumes potential crayon usage time; extremely limited undergraduate studies in the arts; occasional elective courses in the arts as part of graduate study, and domestic and foreign travel (in which visits to art museums are more akin to those of tourists than visiting scholars). Only a small percentage of American schools employ specially trained teachers of the arts; where subject specialists are employed, teachers of the arts of dance, drama, architecture, photography, and environmental design, or teachers who even possess competence in these areas in addition to their specialty, are very seldom included. Those few schools which do employ special teachers usually overwork them so that 30 minutes of art or music every two weeks is about the average time specialists in the arts spend with each class.

A recent, but quite deplorable, innovation in elementary education is the designation of classroom teachers who have shown a better-than-average ability to teach the arts as special leaders or consultants in the arts. These people are usually good, experienced classroom teachers. But they should, instead, typify the classroom teacher with whom genuine specialists in the arts could effectively work, rather than assume the roles of competently-trained arts specialists.

4. At the secondary level, according to the most recently published statistics, courses in art are available to less than half of the students, usually as electives which are not recommended (by guidance counselors, school principals, and teachers of subjects other than the arts) for verbally, mathematically, or scientifically bright students. In actual practice, less than 15 percent of American secondary school students take a course in the arts, usually a short, creative expression-oriented series of weekly "experiences" offered in the seventh or eight grades.

In the few instances where art and music are required or made electively available, the emphasis is, once again, almost entirely placed upon creative expression, with little time given to the development of students' aesthetic value judgment-making abilities; even in expression-oriented courses, little time is given to the artistic and aesthetic evaluation of student-produced works!

The preparation for professional careers which most high school art students receive is inadequate. Sometimes it is diametrically opposed to the courses of study these students will follow in college or university art departments or professional art schools. As a result, a sizable number of "A" and "B" (art grade average) high school graduates are placed in a disadvantaged position in college where they must un-learn certain concepts and techniques acquired in secondary school.

A number of college and professional art school instructors believe that no high school art courses would be better than wrongly-oriented ones, whether such courses are intended for art majors or for others. Many institutions of higher learning now require all students to take an introductory course in the history and sometimes the practice of art during their first or second year. The high school graduate who believes that Norman Rockwell is "as good an artist" as Picasso or Matisse, or thinks that proficiency in transparent watercolor technique or fashion illustration will help him get an "A" or "B" in college art courses is almost certain to be rewarded with embarrassment.

THE CONDITION OF THE ARTS IN MORE PROMISING PROGRAMS OF EDUCATION

Implicit in the following description of more promising art education programs is the assumption that many, if not most, of the unsatisfactory conditions described above are either in the process of improvement or have already been improved. Further improvements will come as new needs are identified and more promising means of meeting them are tried, until the best possible means are found.

The foregoing procedures have often required radical changes in the total programs of schools, districts, even entire regions in which the arts are now a more integral and more respected part. These changes usually have been brought about by the efforts of enlightened teachers, administrators, school board members, consultants, artists, able students, laymen, professional organizations, and scholars, significantly including leaders in disciplines once thought to be separate from art.

We shall now describe some avant garde developments or "educational thrusts" which characterize some of the most sound, forward-looking, and truly exciting conditions and practices in the arts in education.

Implementing Focillon's breakthrough concept that "art is art, and only as such can it be studied," and assuming the relevance to the arts of Albert Einstein's belief that "very young children are capable of grasping the most advanced theoretical concepts of mathematics and physics," a pioneering group of persons at all levels of education have determined to place the arts in their long-deserved position of prominence in education as well as in the modern world culture. These persons have been highly influential in conceiving, developing, and implementing many of the conditions and practices described here. The latter are, by no means, inclusive of many which might be cited, but they exemplify many others which possess similar characteristics of aesthetic excellence, radical change, and significant improvement.

A few institutions of higher learning in North America, Europe, Asia, and elsewhere have made far-reaching changes in their programs of study for persons wishing to prepare for careers in the arts. Unique, and possibly most important, is the creation of inter-disciplinary curricula, programs of study, or "work areas." The fluidity of these programs permits students and faculty of several arts areas and related disciplines to draw freely upon another in projects ranging from individual creative work or the depth study of one aspect of a single subject at one extreme, to the emergent "total (or multiple) disciplinary" areas of environmental design, "total theater," and "total art."

This innovation encourages students, faculty members, and guest specialists to pursue their careers while choosing their own methods and pace; to work in depth and breadth, independently or in groups; and to work on a degree or non-degree basis if they decide to prepare for professional careers at an institution of higher learning. The eventual effect of this highly fluid innovation is difficult to predict, but present evidence points toward deep, yet widespread, improvements in the career development of those involved.

An additional and long needed development in the arts is the rapidly increasing rate of interinstitutional cooperation. Institutions of higher learning and other schools which have begun work in the "total art" field are already cooperating actively. Other institutions which have not yet become involved in inter-disciplinary programs are also engaging in cooperative undertakings.

Among the many movements involved in this inter-school, inter-level educational innovation is the Advanced Placement Program for selected high school students who are permitted to take college course work for credit. There are also informal advanced-placement programs in which students on various levels engage in study, creative work, and other activities at educational institutions and community centers.

A few examples will illustrate this evolving, open-ended development in the arts. Indeed, the arts are but one of its many-disciplined facets. The various disciplines tend to lose their specific identity through involvement in this aspect of contemporary art; yet each of them simultaneously tends to make overall gains in quality of performance, study, learning, and teaching, as well as in broadly significant contributions to society at large.

College and professional art school students and instructors are offering advanced work (or in some cases, less advanced work aimed at psychological or sociological goals) in the study of one or a combination of the arts to individuals and groups ranging from pre-schoolers to the aged. On occasion, the student groups are made up of varied combinations of age, interest, and ability groups. Included are in-service workshops for teachers, which are very unlike the "how to do it" variety common in the past, and combined classes for parents and pre-school children. There are also daytime, evening, or Saturday classes for children taught by college instructors, simultaneously providing unconventional and often improved student-teaching opportunities for future teachers. Other programs include special classes for college or professional school art, or non-art, majors, graduate students, and teachers from various levels of education. These classes are conducted by distinguished professionals on university campuses or off-campus locations such as Arizona State University's summer institute in environmental design at Paolo Soleri's workshop near Taliesin West.

Other classes, workshops, or institutes meet at professional schools, public or private schools, community centers, in open rural areas, and even congested urban environments as in the case of "events" and "happenings" led by such avant-gardists as Allan Kaprow, and Robert Whitman, and the music-art-dance organization of John Cage, Robert Rauschenberg, and Merce Cunningham.

Sometimes student groups travel to a college, professional school, or community center because the atmosphere or equipment is a major factor; the teacher or leader may also go to a somewhat remote area to reduce the burden of travel for an entire class or to encourage a greater response among participants. The writer is presently engaged in such a project where he travels 40 miles weekly with a station wagon load of original art works to a school district where some 100 teachers invited him to offer a course dealing with the role of art in the teaching of emergent humanities courses.

Another desirable practice is the full or part time employment of distinguished professional artists, scholars, and performing groups as artists-in-residence, visiting lecturers, guest teachers, or researchers at all educational levels. These experts may not be asked to teach classes, but usually do so voluntarily because they are aware that students need opportunities for interchange with recognized leaders in the arts.

Also recommended is the development, at all educational levels, of collections or original works of art; disc, tape, and film recordings of music, lectures, dramas, and motion pictures, and full-color and occasionally full-scale reproductions of art masterworks. Collections can also be made of folk art and other comparatively inexpensive original art objects; slides and filmstrips, and coordinated slide-tape presentations such as those developed at the Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass., under the direction of Bartlett Hayes; "teaching kits" such as the neighborhood planning unit developed by Victor D'Amico of New York's Museum of Modern Art, and student produced slide-tape and other instructional materials such as those developed under Professor Eugene Grigsby of Arizona State University at Tempe.

A comparatively unexplored development is the concept of striving for the widest possible heterogeneity in student populations, arts faculties, and opportunity for choice in subject matter, styles, and working methods. Variations in scheduling and the sizes of classes, student bodies, faculties, and physical plants are other possibilities.

In only a few instances have conscious efforts been made to implement the concept of planned heterogeneity as a possible means of attaining higher quality in creative productivity and aesthetic understanding. These include attempts to secure students and faculty members who are representative of different races, nationalities, religions, interests, types of academic training, stylistic orientations or preferences, and (in previously all male or all female schools) of both sexes. Further efforts have been made to include persons who may be regarded as limited, too advanced, or too gifted to adjust to the student body, course, class, faculty, or community.

In those institutions where planned heterogeneity has been attained in varying degrees, every indication points toward increasingly fruitful results in the development of art expressive abilities and aesthetic understanding of both students and faculty, not to mention the obvious psychological, sociological, political, religious, and other integrative benefits.

GOVERNMENTAL AND PRIVATE PHILANTHROPIC SUBSIDIZATION OF EDUCATION IN THE ARTS

The following analysis is based upon the writer's study of some 50 governmental and private philanthropically supported grant proposals and projects, and of supplementary literature pertaining to these projects; numerous personal interviews with arts project personnel and others in the fields of education, government, and the arts, and upon the writer's personal artistic productivity in painting, art collecting, teaching, administrative, and other experiences.

Although objectivity has been attempted, personal subjective reactions are bound to cause this analysis to differ from a report based upon similar conditions made by a person with a different background and interests. On the other hand, there are certain elements in this analysis which appear so clear cut that they would almost without question appear in a report made by nearly any responsible professional person in the field of the arts.

In nearly all of the proposals reviewed, in the site visits and related interviews, and in a study of pertinent literature, the term "cultural enrichment" was dominant. Undoubtedly the use of this term is sincere, but it appears that many persons engaged in what they consider "cultural enrichment" are semantically, artistically, or aesthetically unaware of its actual meaning.

To attempt to enrich culturally a school district, community, region, or nation, is one thing. But to merely disseminate existing or even somewhat increased cultural resources over a much broader portion of a region than before is another matter. The latter practice, as Margaret Mead and other perceptive persons have indicated, can actually do more harm than good. The writer is convinced that the majority of government and private philanthropically subsidized "cultural enrichment" projects are doing little more than scratching the surface of culture.

Persons in charge of subsidized arts programs are frequently victims of severe limitations imposed by personnel and conditions both within and without the geographic areas in which they are working. These limiting factors include: uncooperative or artistically unenlightened persons in positions of school or community leadership; inadequately trained teachers and other personnel who, even when willing, are actually unable to render significant assistance; slowness of public response toward change; widespread belief among artistically uneducated persons that they know "good from bad" in the arts (already a clear indication of their ignorance of the fact that these are not terms applicable to aesthetic value judgment-making); the difficulty and expense involved in importing good works of art and performing artists to schools and communities, and the difficult, and often unwise, practice of transporting children or community residents to cultural resource centers.

Just as there is no "best" or "worst" work of art, or artist, in terms of the aesthetic value judgment-making of more than one person's subjective responses, so, too, there is no "best" or "worst" government or private philanthropically subsidized arts project. There are, however, works of art, artists, and art projects which might, in the opinion of significant numbers of well-informed persons, be regarded as "good" or "better." It is with the latter categories of quality that this section of the paper will deal.

Although leading artists and art critics in some foreign countries claim that the condition and stature of the arts and artists in their countries are as good as those in the United States, there is no doubt that the condition and stature of the arts and artists in the United States are as good as they are anywhere else in the world. Increasing numbers of leading artists and critics from foreign countries have emigrated to or visited the United States at an accelerating rate for more than three decades.

The hundreds of world-renowned artists, critics, scholars, teachers, collectors, and connoisseurs who are aesthetically conversant with these artists and their works constitute an unparalleled cultural reservoir which is more readily available for educational tapping than is commonly realized. Leading artists and others in associated fields have stated their willingness to work for the betterment of education in the arts.

What is now needed, and is indeed emerging, is a coterie of educators and other leaders in the arts who will bring students and teachers at all educational levels into direct and sustained contact with top-flight artists and the finest works of art. A growing number of artists, educators, and civic-minded individuals have sensed this need; hopefully, they will help to bring about the long-awaited liaison between art, artists, critics, scholars, and the society of which they as well as children, adolescents, teachers, and the lay public are integral parts.

A number of these leaders have begun to look upon the arts as interrelated elements of a cultural whole. This outlook in itself demonstrates a breakthrough which is demolishing artificial barriers separating art, music, dance, literature, and other subject areas.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF SUBSIDIZED PROJECTS IN THE ARTS

The need for more and better guidance from leading educators, artists, scholars, and culturally-enlightened persons both within and outside of the geographic areas served by subsidized arts projects, as well as from staff members from appropriate agencies, has been made clearly evident to the writer.

Partly due to the lack of intensive guidance services, and also due to a prevailing concept that funds should be "democratically" shared by all persons and institutions within reach, arts project personnel are reluctant to initiate comparative studies of depth immersion versus superficial exposure in two or more classes, schools, districts, or communities. In almost every arts project studied or visited by the writer, the personnel involved feel that comparative studies would do more harm than good in what they regard as the first of several stages of regional acculturation. Even where grants have been made for projects of two or three years' duration, personnel have been reluctant to start cooperative studies on even a pilot basis. The writer believes that if staff members of appropriate governmental or private philanthropic agencies would stress the importance of comparative studies, this reluctance would be overcome.

An expert or team of experts should be sent to the sites of proposed arts projects to determine in advance the validity of assumptions, procedures, and goal expectancies described by applicants. Due to local conditions (including pressure groups), long-standing practices, friendships, the prominence of regional artists, and the size and locations of various communities and schools, as well as the degree of forcefulness of personnel, certain arts projects seem almost sure to succeed or fail even before they start.

The stated opinions of experts who have made thorough site visitations prior to allocation of grants would make possible a much wiser expenditure of funds. Appraisal by experts would also provide more opportunities for project administrators to develop and implement their programs on the basis of professionally recognized cultural needs than would be likely if pressure groups and other potentially hampering factors were left uncurtailed.

Specific attention is directed to the need for persons in the arts to be aided cooperatively by representatives from other fields. Not only the advice but the actual involvement of highly qualified personnel from fields such as anthropology, mathematics, philosophy, psychology, the biological and physical sciences, and sociology should be sought. This recommendation would unquestionably require the involvement of persons of national or international distinction in their fields; thus, in many cases it would probably be necessary to make only indirect or partial use of their services.

Where necessary, greater breadth of representation within the increasingly broad field of the arts should also be required. Art educators sometimes tend to exclude practicing artists, art historians, art sociologists, and art critics from the government grant personnel lists. Artists and art critics, on the other hand, sometimes tend to exclude art educators and art historians.

The approach to educational problems in the arts taken by professional artists and leaders in other fields often contrasts with that of artists, art educators, art critics, art historians, and particularly school administrators. To derive the fullest benefits from professionals, they should have opportunities to explore projects in ways they best see fit and to suggest how their services might best be used. To do otherwise often results in the loss of both their services and their interest in projects developed by others.

A brief description of one instance in which a professional artist became disenchanted after his first encounter with a subsidized arts project may add weight to the foregoing recommendation. The artist had been invited to a public high school to demonstrate and talk about his painting concepts and techniques. He was pleased by the invitation and wondered why he had not been asked to participate in similar projects in the past. Upon arriving at the school, however, he was shocked to discover that instead of meeting with a relatively large group or even two smaller groups, he was expected to take over all five of the art teacher's regular classes plus a night course for adults. The artist's comment to the writer after a 14-hour day was, "Never again!"

All possible media of mass communication should be utilized by subsidized arts project participants. Although videotaped and other mass media recordings are less valuable than live presentations, such materials are extremely useful, especially in serving residents of remote geographic areas.

Most instructional programs in the arts at both the elementary and secondary school levels have placed so much emphasis upon creative expression that the subject matter or content of the arts (the development of aesthetic value judgment-making ability concerning major works by distinguished professionals) has often been grossly neglected.

Programs of art education at all school levels and related subsidized projects should greatly increase the time and money spent in securing original professional art works of the highest possible caliber. Such examples should range from original paintings and live music performances to slides, good reproductions, slide-tape presentations, tape and disc recordings, films, filmstrips, and illustrated art books and magazines.

The proportion of time which should be devoted to the content area of the arts, as recommended by leading art educators, ranges from one-fifth content and four-fifths creative expression at the primary school level to four-fifths content and one-fifth creative expression at the senior high level.

Sponsoring agencies should offer training institutes for personnel involved both administratively and instructionally in arts projects. Such institutes should include demonstration teaching by experts and observation of lesson presentations to children, adolescents, and adults, depending on the needs, capabilities, and plans of participating personnel. These institutes help to improve administrative and teaching practices and should include specialized work in both the content and expressive aspects of the arts, educational philosophy and psychology, public relations techniques, the preparation, design, distribution, and use of published literature, evaluative techniques, and the development of improved means of preparing in-process and final reports on subsidized projects.

One of the major weaknesses of subsidized projects in the arts is the well-intentioned but unrealistic aim of bringing cultural enrichment to as many people as possible within a large geographic area. As a result, too many people are getting too little culture. It would be much wiser to greatly enrich the arts education of smaller numbers, with the expectation that through improved practices and monetary allocations within school districts and communities and grants from governmental and other agencies, programs of significant cultural enrichment could gradually be extended to other groups.

The arts professions have matured to the point where they now realize that highly-trained specialists are best qualified to guide educational growth in the arts. They rightfully oppose the concept of the self-contained classroom in which a generally-trained teacher functioning without the services of art specialists is expected to provide learning and expressive experiences in the arts. They also oppose the concept of self-contained subsidized arts projects in which inadequately qualified personnel are expected to guide learning and expressive experiences in the arts.

Project grants for the arts should be restricted to districts or regions in which specially-trained teachers of art, dance, drama, music, and literature are already employed or will be employed by means of regulations and funds provided by the sponsoring agencies.

Copyright 1967

Certain portions of this paper are based upon the following books and/or reports written by the author: Art in Education (1963); Art Education (1964); report of a United States Office of Education-sponsored Seminar on Elementary and Secondary Schools: Education in the Visual Arts (1965); research report, Art for Schools (1966); and a United States Office of Education report (Higher Education Act, Title III), The Arts in Education (1966).

V PROMOTING CHANGE THROUGH INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

PERSPECTIVES ON STUDENTS

In any educational venture, the role of the student is central. Any innovation or reorganization demands careful analysis regarding its ultimate effect on the student. Will it provide intellectual and cultural enrichment, thus preparing the student to perform effectively in society? Is the change merely an institutional novelty with little real value for the student?

These questions must be pondered even more thoroughly in programs of interinstitutional cooperation. To make sure that such programs do result in student advancement, it is important that we more fully understand the role of the student in higher education.

The preceding chapter offers evidence that meaningful educational experiences for students are not always achieved. Many relatively affluent students in "Ivy League" institutions are restless and dissatisfied with an education that has little meaning in the broader context of their lives as are students in developing schools who are alienated in comparable ways.

"Whatever else we do, it is terribly important that in his passage through the educational world the student's self-esteem gets preserved in the greatest possible way," writes Doctor Katz.

In his paper on the Negro and Higher education, Doctor Crosby agrees that students need more confidence in themselves. He notes that students learn in different ways, and that educators must build on these various learning styles. The Negro student especially must be aware of his intrinsic worth, since he is constantly bombarded to conform to white middle class standards.

Art education properly upgraded could make the arts a humanizing experience and hence more relevant for students. Howard Conant urges that professional artists and related experts be utilized more thoroughly to give students a wider exposure to the arts. A cultural breakthrough is likely if leaders in the arts work "to improve the cultural condition of modern society and to look upon the arts as interrelated elements of a cultural whole."

The need for maintaining the student's self-respect was also stressed in the discussion following these papers. Basically, students in all institutions share this need to be respected as individuals. Students in the established schools must be provided an atmosphere in which fulfilling human commitments can be made; students in the developing institutions must be assured that they are important in themselves, not as educational pawns in some administrative innovation. In the discussion, the following viewpoints were advanced, regarding the position of students in both types of institutions.

PERSPECTIVE ON THE STUDENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION:

Students Need Status

The student considered in a social role, strictly speaking, is absolutely worthless to anyone outside himself. He is deprived of utility; he has little demand value. Perhaps he can bring an honor to his family with grades, but outside of that he is of little value to others. At the same time, he's surrounded by teachers who are professionals, who have achieved the status of being of ultimate value to mankind. The student is faced with the fact of his own uselessness to others and is deprived of role models of utility other than this professional model. The middle class student probably has never even seen his father at work, never been into the plant. If he's a lower class kid, he's probably never seen his father. The upper class kid knows that somebody will pick him up from prep school, but he does not know who that person really is. Both students are isolated and deprived. Everything is in the future, but give them the least little opportunity to help others, to do something for its own value, and they soar.

Activists Affect Social Conditions

The word "activist" identifies those who are doing something actively about their own condition and about those social conditions that affect them or other people. If you get rid of these activists, you get rid of more than the people who disturb your peace. You're getting rid of some of the most intellectually lively students.

Overcoming Student Passivity

In an underdeveloped college, one finds a fairly sizable group of students who can be characterized validly as passive. On the whole they have accepted the social system and its conditionings. The problem is what the educational institution should do to wake them up, to confront them. It happens so often that encounters with people different from them simply causes these students to isolate themselves.

Need for Confidence Stressed

To overcome that kind of passivity, you can't just expect to give people the opportunity, you have to think of facilitating the situations to bring out that dormant activism that all of us have. You would have to experiment with these students, because they have been told that in order to be acceptable to our society they must behave in certain ways. For example, we usually tell them the English they use isn't English. In a sense, that is an insult. Yet it happens all the time. You can really make people educable only if they have confidence in themselves.

Does Student Exchange Work?

I wonder if this isn't enough reason for a wholesale student exchange? One set for another. Should this not be the central thrust of Title III?

Students Teach Each Other

If you can find students who are trying to get something from each other, student exchange would be one of the greatest benefits. Much of the relevant education that students get comes from each other rather than from the classroom.

Exchanges Can Misfire

Yet, at the same time, we were saying that it is terribly important that students, particularly from the developing institutions, learn to be successful. Much of the problem of these exchanges is that you get a few "white knights," or terribly privileged characters, from the established schools at the Negro college. They say, "Isn't it interesting?" And the students who go to advanced schools from the developing institutions are kind of lost.

Grades Are Important

From the point of view of the exchange students from the developing college, grades are tremendously important. Everyone that I talked to about joining such a program said something like this, "I want to prove to myself that I can go to these schools and make out. I've been told that I couldn't make it at these schools, and I just want to show everybody that I can . . ." Those who applied were exceptional in the sense that these were students who were willing to try something new--these kinds of students are unusual on our campus.

PERSPECTIVE ON THE ROLE OF THE INSTITUTIONS IN IMPLEMENTING STUDENT GAINS

Match Students with Schools

Another part of the problem beyond the selection of students is the selection of the institutions to which the student will go. This is where we often fall down: there is no effort to match the qualifications of the student and the whole learning atmosphere of the institution. Much more effort needs to be put into the quality of experience so there is already prediction that this experience will be successful because of the environment to which the student is going. This is important in terms of preserving a student's self-esteem.

Creative Students May Fail

Some investigators have found that there is not necessarily a correlation between creativity or imagination and a high I.Q. score. What is it that we can do in our educational system to try and save individuals who are very imaginative, very creative, yet who cannot cut the ice in our educational establishments? From biographies of some well known creative people, I learn that many of them were dropouts from high school. Others had difficulties in college. Yet these people are composing music, performing in the arts, and so on.

Are Developing Colleges Needed?

I'm beginning to feel more in the position of the emperor with his new cloak. Why do we need the developing colleges? Let's scrap them all. But when I say "Let's have them go to Wisconsin or New York University," I remember that the emperor was naked.

Smaller Schools Can Contribute

I have been involved in quite a bit of VISTA and Peace Corps training and we have found that one of the best places for the Peace Corps trainee is in the small liberal arts colleges, often the predominantly Negro college. For our Peace Corps graduates of training programs at the larger or better established universities, something basic seems to be missing. The one experience they haven't had in those universities is learning something from someone whom they had defined as being beneath their status, like a teacher who is surprisingly good but who happens to be a Negro. Time after time, we get this cultural shock effect from graduates of the University of Wisconsin, when they go out to Central State College in Ohio and learn Yourba from a Negro teacher. Some of these teachers also have the ability to teach other subjects that the Peace Corps people need like boiling water, animal husbandry, family planning, and home economics. Here's a beautiful example where the developing college has it all over the large so-called established institution.

Role Reversal Stimulates

This proposed Michigan-Tuskegee research institute is really one way of preserving two closed institutions, of ignoring outside influence. It's not giving the undergraduates at the big institution a chance to be taught how to teach by the professors from the small institution. It's not reversing any roles, it's not creating any action. It's another little subprofessional thing called a research institute. What I'm hoping will come out of interinstitutional cooperation is the thing that comes out of the poverty program and the Peace Corps at their best. This is real role reversal, where the guy we all thought was underdeveloped teaches us something of value. That's a thrilling thing, somehow.

Statistics on Negro Students

As a matter of record, there are about 250,000-275,000 Negroes attending college at the present. Somewhat more than half of them are in the predominantly Negro college . . . About three percent of students enrolled in formal secondary education are Negro. The population is approaching 11 percent. About six percent of the institutions, post secondary are predominantly Negro.

Negro Schools Stress Liberal Arts

There is a generally mistaken impression that the Negro schools are predominantly concerned with vocational and technical subjects. In fact, they pattern their offerings after the traditional New England liberal arts college. Almost exclusively, the curriculum patterns in these colleges are watered-down imitations of the liberal arts programs, and there is very little of the vocational-technical kind of course offering. The most professional type training that goes on in these colleges is in teacher training; unfortunately many job opportunities for teaching are drying up. Once there were complete school

> systems that would guarantee jobs for Negroes, but these are slowly being integrated or Negroes are being systematically excluded from teaching jobs.

Practical Aspects

> I seem to achieve a better rapport talking to the president of a small Negro college in the South than I do talking to a dean at a northern university on interinstitutional cooperation. The Negro administrators see the practical nature of what it is their undergraduates are going to be doing if they make it in this society. Which is to enter not just the academic class or the professional class, but the managerial class.

Defining the role of the student in interinstitutional cooperation is not simple, but a primary consideration in any such program is the provision for student growth. The schools should consider more widespread student exchanges, as students can learn a great deal from each other outside the classroom. In such programs, it is important that students be matched with their prospective schools to assure a fruitful experience and to preserve their self-esteem.

Students from established schools could benefit from study at developing institutions, if they approach the experience with a receptive, rather than a condescending, attitude. Such openness can result in the rewarding pay off in role reversal where the guy we all thought was underdeveloped teaches us how to live with each other.

SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The Higher Education Act of 1965 has far-reaching social implications. Instead of merely providing more-of-the-same programs for more-of-the-same students, it reaches out to include those traditionally separated from higher education. Most Negroes have limited opportunities but a larger number of whites - some even on campuses - are alienated from meaningful educational experiences.

It is inconsistent for a democratic nation to endorse equality of education when the overwhelming majority of its Negro population is out of the educational mainstream. Educators must face up to their failure to serve the American Negro; they must correct this tragic failing before a genuine "Great Society" can be built.

More than a century after the Civil War, higher education is still not ready for the Negro. Lawrence C. Howard cites data to show that over half of the country's Negro college students are enrolled in predominantly Negro schools. Even those in integrated institutions are clustered in junior or community colleges and concentrated in a few academic fields which prepare them to serve other Negroes. Those few at the major universities are often uncomfortable in the prevailing white middle class atmosphere. Their sense of separation is increased by an academic philosophy reflecting European perspectives and by educational goals which stress elitism. Few Negroes are in high academic or administrative posts in these schools where faculty members in general adapt to suburban living patterns.

As civil rights winds blow across the campuses, colleges are concerned about righting this historic wrong. Yet the piecemeal projects in vogue today are not even effective enough to keep the percentage of Negro students from declining as the university enrollments soar. More fundamental steps must be taken before any basic improvement can result.

An outline for decisive gains is provided in the document, Blueprint for Action. It directs institutions to first set themselves in order with upgraded remedial and counseling services, flexible admissions standards, realistic scholarship programs, more graduate opportunities, and added openings for Negroes in academic and administrative posts. After that, the schools should engage in more fundamental activities in the larger society to stress the educational desirability of integration and to certify that higher education really needs the Negro.

Integrated institutions are usually concerned about the adjustment of Negro students to college life. However, these schools are often less careful about their own adjustment to Negro students. Observing that many institutions treat Negro students with clumsy deference, Doxey A. Wilkerson and Edmund W. Gordon suggest ways in which private liberal arts colleges in the North can improve their performance.

Educators must realize that their job does not end when they welcome Negro students to the campus; once there, these students must be helped to stay in school. Problems stemming from educational deficiencies, poverty, unsophisticated approaches to college life, and the lurking fear of discrimination can be eased through personal guidance from understanding faculty members. Colleges should reject any impulses to put their Negro students on display. As part of a small minority, these students rightfully resent or are embarrassed by such public attention. It is important, also, that more than a token number of Negroes are admitted to these schools. Strains arising from a stilted social atmosphere are usually relieved when the number of Negro students is increased.

Coping with the identity problems of Negro students is more difficult, but colleges can help these students find dignity and meaning in their lives. For this objective, institutions should establish a rapport with the main currents of Negro life; revise curricula to broaden the educational perspective on the Negro; identify themselves with the Negro revolution, and create an atmosphere of respect for all people.

In his second paper in this chapter, Doctor Howard joined by Marc Lee, a student at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, repeats that now is the time to plan for the integrated society of tomorrow. The university, with its balance between organization and spontaneity, is the ideal nurturing ground for integration. To date, higher education has not accepted the challenge to serve as the sanctuary for the civil rights movement. Students active in civil rights work concentrate their activities in northern ghettos or in the South; college administrators are under many pressures to frown on such activities on their own campuses. More enlightened educators engage the university in trouble shooting projects in slum areas, chiefly to prepare Negro students for college. However, these projects do not stimulate the personal involvement sought by students and can even add to the campus bureaucracy that has alienated students in the first place.

What is needed is a real commitment to integration by the university, matching the dedication of student activists. A program linking the University of Wisconsin with three southern Negro colleges raised hopes for such a commitment. Initial exchanges pointed to the potential of a more intensive program in which University of Wisconsin could become a laboratory of integration. Unfortunately, this momentous experiment was never tried: Wisconsin shortchanged itself by this refusal to become a microcosm of racial harmony.

To the question of whether Negro colleges should exist at all, Michael J. Horowitz gives an emphatic, "Yes." These institutions not only serve a majority of Negro students but will continue to provide leadership in this transitional period before full integration is achieved. Besides, Negro colleges have certain strengths, notably in motivating and educating students who might be discouraged at other institutions.

In their bid for Title III funds, Negro colleges have certain priorities: they are often the chief sources of higher education in their areas; they normally have to compensate for the educational deficiencies of their students, and they are vital influences on the achievement of their students, who come largely from low socio-economic, minority backgrounds. Thus Title III money spent on upgrading Negro colleges represents a sound financial investment.

Increased use of the new training technology should also be considered in interinstitutional cooperation. Charles W. Slack indicates that the new technology, developed mainly outside of higher education, could be used to raise I.Q.'s and improve student preparation in the educational fundamentals. Another possibility is increased interchange between American industry and the Negro colleges which have basic values in common. In fact, American industry in general would benefit through more intensive relationships with colleges and universities.

IS HIGHER EDUCATION READY FOR THE NEGRO

Lawrence C. Howard
Director, Institute of Human Relations
The University of Wisconsin

The Higher Education Act of 1965 is now law. It provides federal funds to aid colleges and universities and it enlists them in the solution of mounting urban problems. Funds are made available to upgrade college libraries, to sponsor cooperative arrangements between colleges, to extend grants to low income students, and to establish a National Teachers' Corps. As a companion to the Elementary and Secondary Act, this historic law, as President Johnson has said, is to give "every child in this land all the education, of the highest quality, which his ambition demands and his mind can absorb."

To have extended help to higher education is an important achievement, but it should also bring out basic policy considerations. Who should be educated and for what? What are the urban problems to be attacked and in what order? With which universities will cooperation be promoted and what kind of relationship will it be? To which students will the grants be made and on what priorities? If universities are now to be "instruments of national purpose in the urban scene," what are the goals that we seek? There are two fairly exclusive options: either we will provide more education for those who have always had it in reach, or we will now bring into higher education those who historically have been separated from the mainstream of American life.

If the Higher Education Act is to fulfill its objectives to expand opportunities and to help in solving urban problems, then program administrators in the United States Office of Education will have to recognize the special needs of the Negro. The isolation of Negro and white communities, said President Johnson in June 1965 at Howard University, is increasing rather than diminishing. Negroes are crowded into central cities--mostly in slums--where they live together, a separated people. It may be less well know that few Negroes go to college or reap the benefits of America's foremost institution--education. If higher education is to respond to these problems of stunted opportunity and racial separation, it will have to join the President in working to build the "Great Society." When it is realized that the goal is an integrated America there will be no further doubt that the Negro is needed.

Americans like to stress that education is the way to get ahead. And so the Negro has been told that education is his answer. In the past "education" was the solution of the gradualist--a tactic to resist change; in the present it is the call of the activist who sincerely wants integration to come. But now it's "Get a college education--the high school diploma will not be enough!" Lawrence E. Dennis, speaking at the 1964 Association of Higher Education meetings, was reiterating a widespread sentiment when he said, "Inevitably, 1964 is emerging as the year in which civil rights and education coalesced. Two of the great revolutions of our time are now one. It will be primarily through education that the Negro enters the mainstream of American life. It is now primarily the task of educators to bring the Negro into the mainstream. . ."

1964 has passed, but the two revolutions have not coalesced. Instead, a mounting and disturbing question has emerged: is higher education ready for the Negro? The answer late in 1967 is not yet!

SEPARATED EDUCATION

The major problem is de facto segregation. While the eleven o'clock Sunday worship hour has been called the most segregated hour in the week, the eight o'clock college class, if not more segregated, is now a major contender for this dubious distinction.

Negroes for the most part attend Negro schools. The United States Office of Education reported 207,316 Negroes in higher education in September, 1965. This data was based upon guesses made by registrars and was possibly an overstatement. The 100 Negro colleges reporting that year to the United States Office of Education had a combined actual enrollment of 125,092 or were accommodating approximately 60 percent of all Negro students. The remaining 82,224 Negro students in college were scattered among 2,100 white schools which enrolled 4.5 million students. The Negroes in white higher education, it should be added, were bunched in a small number of colleges and universities primarily in northern cities--New York, Los Angeles, Chicago and Detroit.

This means that in "integrated higher education" fewer than two college students in 100 are Negro.

A closer look at the Negro in the white northern college presents an even more unfavorable picture. More frequently than not, he is a part-time rather than a resident student and is in a junior or community college rather than in a liberal arts college, a large private university, or a state or land-grant university. A heavy percentage of the nation's institutions of higher learning do not have a single Negro.

Moreover, where Negroes are enrolled in northern colleges and universities, they are further concentrated in theology, law, social work, education, dentistry, and medicine--the fields which send them back to service other Negroes. However, the fact is that most Negroes never graduate. It is unusual for the biggest universities in this country to award more than three or four baccalaureate degrees to Negroes in any one year.

Going one step further, in the so-called "integrated" institutions of the North, one must search to find the handful of Negroes serving on governing boards, or as department chairmen, deans, vice-presidents, provosts, chancellors, or presidents. And in the more than 2,300 public and private colleges and universities in America, one seldom hears of a Negro who is director of admissions, dean of men or women, the head of a counceling service, or director of a scholarship program--even for a community college.

The stark fact is that Negroes are not to be found in higher education in the North in proportion to their numbers or their qualifications.

Isolating the Negro from the "mainstream" of higher education has deep historical roots. In the 17th and 18th centuries, colleges were founded in America to turn out white ministers, lawyers, and "gentlemen." Separate institutions were set up for Negroes, and they came late in the 19th century with the stress on vocational training. No Negro was graduated from any American college until 1826 when John B. Russworm received a degree from Bowdoin. America's oldest college, Harvard, was in existence more than two centuries before it awarded an A. B. degree to a Negro, Richard T. Greener, in 1870.

This continuing separation from the Negro is part of higher education's estrangement from people--especially from city people. American colleges were deliberately placed, at the beginning, in rural places. They were modeled after Cambridge and Oxford rather than the urban institutions at Bologna and Paris. With the rise of state universities and land-grant colleges in the late 19th century, the pastoral concept remained. New institutions were located at Columbia, not St. Louis; at Columbus, not Cleveland; at Ann Arbor, not Detroit, at Urbana, not Chicago; at Boulder, not Denver; and at Madison, not Milwaukee. With few exceptions, it was only in the 20th century that colleges located in the cities.

It is because the city has grown up around the college that higher education has come into contact with people. Yet, while an institution may bring cultural programs, employment possibilities, and prestige to a community, it often has little impact on the Negro. A nearby college is still a world apart, a citadel of learning for others. For some Negroes, the institution is little known; for others it is an employer for menial jobs, a land owner of sub-standard housing, or the cause of eviction from one marginal neighborhood to another.

College life in the northern university is carried on almost exclusive of Negroes. It is not just that students are white, they are also increasingly middle class, despite the efforts of many institutions to attract students from the lower economic groups. On most campuses, college life means a car, a suitable wardrobe, dormitory or fraternity living, and sufficient leisure to study and play. Prevailing middle class patterns of living mean that students rarely have experiences with Negroes.

College faculties are equally exclusive. Caplow and McGee in 1958 stated bluntly that no major white university had anything more than a token representation of Negroes on its faculty. Five years later, this condition was reconfirmed when the University of Chicago hired a Negro historian and the New York Times coverage of the appointment became a nationwide news story.

The path to faculty positions is the Ph. D., white university, campus-bound endurance race. Requirements for promotion and tenure force professors away from the community. "In the academic guild," writes David Reisman, "its's the professional associations, not the community, that count." The rising standard of living for the professor has meant that he, too, has fled the central city for suburbia. The professor's reasons are much the same as other suburbanites'--to escape the changing neighborhoods of the city.

The Negro's isolation is also reflected in courses and curriculum. American university courses are European transplants and they reveal European perspectives. Even in the comparatively new social sciences, the debt to Europe is heavy: Comte, Freud, Weber, Rousseau, Marx. Despite some breaking of political yokes, American scholarship is a reflection of Europe's intellectual hegemony. And as the Negro has identified with African nationalism, he has often found himself in conflict with this scholarship.

Little has been written on the Negro in American history other than by Negroes or foreign observers. Negro historians such as Du Bois, Woodson, and Franklin have not only protested against omissions, but have also attempted to revise prevailing historical perspectives on Negro-white relationships. It was therefore not surprising that behavioral scientists had not prepared us for "The Long Hot Summer" or for Watts. The subcultures of the Negro remain largely unstudied. As in the public school texts, college materials reflect an all-white world.

Even some popular statements about the purposes of higher education point the way to the exclusion of the Negro. The "community of scholars" ideal often means a group cut away from people. Nurturing the academically talented too often means fostering elitism. And when all this is done under the guise of nurturing the nation's cultural heritage, then the Negro, from experience, rejects much of what the culture presents.

It is not surprising then that the Negro has not become part of the white university system. To enter means going into a different cultural environment which is not only foreign to many of his home experiences, but also highly critical of them. Once in the system, it is often difficult for him to distinguish his performance from his reception as a "Negro student." And in his subsequent search for employment it is hard to separate his credentials from his color. The longer the Negro stays in white higher education, the more irrepressible are the questions to him of its relevance. He must ask himself whether to continue his professional pursuits or to respond to the more personal call to rally to the need of the Negro in American life. To succeed in the race to publish can mean paying the price of purging his racial identity.

Even though the doors of northern higher education have generally been open, the location of these institutions, their composition, curriculum, and purposes often contrive to keep the Negro out. In this "educative" society the institutions of higher learning have estranged themselves from a large segment of educables. The boundaries of the university have not been extended to include the entire community of which it is a part, and consequently it has not been able to adequately serve this community. And yet it is also the Negro's choice not to enter higher education. The wall of exclusion is partly his. The separation in the higher education of Negroes and whites comes from both sides.

WINDS OF CHANGE

All this is not to say that colleges and universities are not concerned. There is a variety of activity. Publications are devoted to programs for the "disadvantaged" like the Yeshiva University IRCD BULLETIN (Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged). Almost every major educational conference or convention devotes a portion of the program to "the problem." Pilot projects abound at every educational level. The public schools stress the early start, to "reverse the effects of a starved environment."

College programs range from the ABC (A Better Chance) Project at Dartmouth, which provides a beef-up prior to the freshman year, to the post-baccalaureate project at Brown, which provides remedial work prior to graduate school. In between there are loans, expanded student counseling, and work-study programs. There is a new look coming to admissions offices as some northern universities actively woo Negro students and faculty.

Within college life there are other changes. Efforts have been made to alter discriminatory consitutions of fraternal groups. Fair housing pledges are being asked by some college housing offices, and at least one university construction has been delayed because a builder did not comply with fair employment laws.

Negro colleges have been studied by Earl McGrath. They are now receiving additional financial support from foundations and a number of them now receive teaching assistance through projects like the Woodrow Wilson Foundation Internship Program. Private foundations have also sponsored summer institutes for Negro college faculty. Cooperative and exchange programs have emerged between seven northern white universities and a comparable number of predominantly Negro southern colleges.

Taken together there is much activity, but there are separate questions as to the extent of progress that has been made.

It is clear that the pace is too slow. All the programs combined will not bring into white higher education enough Negroes to keep pace with the expansion in enrollment these colleges are undergoing. This means that despite these efforts, the percentage of Negroes in white higher education has fallen in the past year. It is also apparent that white higher education has not changed its mind about having

Negroes trained mainly in Negro colleges. Both the summer institutes and the exchange programs remain one-way operations in which "big brother" paternalistic attitudes are thinly veiled. The great bulk of expanding opportunities is foundation supported. Were this prop removed, the programs and projects would stop.

It is not easy to assail a massive industry such as higher education for not acting to overcome educational separation. Intentions are good, the commitment to extend opportunities has been restated, but the project approach is not the answer. These are not basic educational changes; they are incidental projects, themselves separated within the college--higher education's extra-curricular response to the civil rights movement. When one looks candidly, it is evident that the last year has brought little real progress. The piece meal project approach will not lead to permanent change in the conditions of de facto segregation in higher education. Unless American colleges and universities are willing to take more fundamental steps, no genuine and lasting improvement can be expected.

GUIDELINES FOR ACTION

It is not that we don't know what to do. Representatives of the Big Ten Universities, Wayne State, and the University of Chicago recently developed a Blueprint for Action for any institution desiring to move quickly and decisively. Former United States Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, endorsed the Blueprint as ". . . a significant milestone of both commitment and cooperation towards progress in the national interest. . . It is recommended priority reading for administrators of both large and small institutions of higher education. . . a model for the kind of serious and positive approach that must be taken." It would be helpful to review this document with the Higher Education Act in mind.

The first task, says the Blueprint, is for higher education to set its own house in order by providing remedial resources commensurate to the historic deficiencies caused by de facto segregation. For both prospective and current under-graduates, universities must drastically revise their counseling services, make admissions standards flexible, base scholarship aid on financial need, and provide a social atmosphere conducive to the mixing of Negroes and whites.

To assure integrated graduate education, regular post-baccalaureate assessment and remedial programs should be established in conjunction with greater use of conditional admission policies. Motivational problems should be met by imaginative programs to assure expanding opportunities for Negro graduates to obtain attractive job opportunities in business and industry as well as in the university itself. These steps will not only help integrate graduate schools beyond "tokenism," it should also assist in upgrading them. These could be direct ways whereby the intention of Title IV (Student Assistance) can be achieved.

Universities must energetically recruit among Negroes, academic and administrative personnel for all levels and especially those of high prestige and responsibility. Every university staff should include personnel drawn from a variety of ethnic, economic, and racial groups. Administrators should promote interracial housing. In both its building program and its financial portfolio, the spirit as well as the letter of federal and state anti-discriminatory laws should be scrupulously observed. Regarding the university's own house, the Blueprint adds:

> These and other internal policy changes can provide a strong base for further action . . . as the institution moves toward expanded programs to help Negro and white students gain a larger perspective on themselves and upon the society they will inherit.

But these measures constitute a mere first step. Higher education must reach out and make sure that many more Negro students come into the pipeline. This will require, as Title I (University Extension) suggests, going far beyond any existing programs. Examples of relevant activities are increased counseling services to high school students and, where appropriate, to parents--on a regular basis. College-sponsored pre-college training programs should become more permanent fixtures to assure that admission is more than the prelude to being dropped at the end of the freshman year. For these efforts to bring more Negroes into higher education and to see them through to graduation, money will be required. The Higher Education Act will provide a start, but in the longer run these expenditures must be made by higher education itself, as an investment expected to pay returns not just to the Negro but to all students.

Work with the public schools must be stepped up. Members of a National Teaching Corps could play a major role in helping the university promote needed reforms. Universities should, following the pattern of the physical sciences, make available the best scholars to bring about the needed changes in teaching methods and materials, particularly in the social sciences. Teacher training should give larger consideration to the schools in the "inner cores" of cities and must be designed not only to inform teachers about sub-cultures in America, but also aim to develop positive appreciation for these sub-cultures. These programs must be of such quality as to help to reverse the flight of teachers to suburban schools, and this work with schools should not preclude the university's responsibility to work for larger social change And in particular the university must build public understanding that an integrated school experience for students is not just morally right, but educationally desirable as well!

Predominantly white universities must close ranks with those institutions which are now mostly Negro. Faculty, administration, and student exchanges should be carried out on a scale proportionate to the Negro percentage in the population. Attention to curriculum reform should be jointly explored with mutual give and take. The aim should be to strengthen these Negro-led institutions to put them in a competitive position to attract and hold good faculty and students of all races. These are the goals that could come under Title III, which would make grants for cooperative agreements to strengthen developing institutions.

The undergirding for these programs to bring the Negro student and scholar into the mainstream of education must be research. White universities should establish joint research projects with Negro institutions. High priority should be given to study of the ways higher education itself can move ahead, especially in understanding and eradicating the more subtle operations of prejudice, in exploring the relationship between attitudes and action, and in illuminating the basic problems of self and social imagery in the learning process. And finally a national clearinghouse and consultative service should be established and adequately financed to cross-fertilize the new ideas, methods, programs, and projects. The Higher Education Act provides for precisely this kind of technical assistance to be formally established as part of a National Advisory Council.

The task at hand for higher education is to actively promote the achievement of integration in education at all levels of itself and in America for every region. Not to assume this leadership, the Blueprint concluded, means to add to a hundred years of educational neglect. To respond generously will be to invest in human capital with assured dividends to our nation. The creative educational policies and approaches that can evolve in a positive effort will greatly improve all of American education. The moral of this is that only when higher education comes to realize it needs the Negro will it be ready to receive him.

BEYOND OPPORTUNITIES

Prior to September 1965, colleges and universities could say they had no funds for such a massive program. The Higher Education Act has contradicted this reply. For those who are to administer the Higher Education Act toward expanding opportunities and bringing the university to the aid of cities, the Blueprint for Action offers a focus and an agenda of projects. The test will be whether higher education will undertake changes in itself. If higher education can overcome separation in itself, it can go beyond expanding opportunities for the Negro to opportunities for America. President Johnson has made clear both the priority and the promise:

> Nothing in any country touches us more profoundly, nothing is more freighted with meaning for our destiny, than the revolution of the Negro American . . . It is the glorious opportunity of this generation to end the one huge wrong of the American nation--and in so doing to find America for ourselves, with the same immense thrill of discovery which gripped those who first began to realize that here, at last, was a home for freedom . . . We can light a candle of understanding in the heart of America. And, once lit, it will never again go out.

IMPROVING COLLEGE PERFORMANCE IN INTEGRATED EDUCATION

Doxey A. Wilkerson, Associate Professor of Education
Yeshiva University

Edmund W. Gordon, Editor, IRCD BULLETIN
(Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged)
Yeshiva University

The recently growing practice among Northern "white" colleges to enroll Negro students, many of them from disadvantaged socio-economic circumstances, is usually accompanied by concern over how these students will adjust to college life. Such concern is often warranted, because large proportions of these students are entering a world totally different from that in which they were nurtured. It may be, however, that an even more important concern would be over how the college will adjust to the demands of integrated education. Many of them evince considerable ineptness and lack of sophistication in developing positive interracial experiences in the classroom and on the campus.

Broad generalizations in this realm, of course, are unwarranted, because of differences among colleges as well as among individual Negro students. Harvard and Oberlin, for example, differ markedly from Princeton and Bucknell in their historical and current approaches to Negro students; and the Negro student who follows in his father's footsteps at Yale and the one whose parents never completed high school tend to approach college life with widely differing perceptions and capabilities. Moreover, there appears to be no substantial, systematically assembled body of data concerning relevant college practices or student experiences. Even so, examination of the considerable anecdotal materials available suggests important ways in which colleges could improve their performance in integrated education.[1]

Attention is here focused on the experience of Negro students in private liberal arts colleges in the North. The problems involved and indicated approaches tend to cluster around the interrelated academic, social and (in a non-religious sense) spiritual areas of college life.

ACADEMIC LIFE

Many Negroes entering Northern colleges are as able scholastically as any other students on the campus. For the most part, they come from middle class homes of professional parents, and they attended good elementary and secondary schools. A few others, although from much less favorable backgrounds, nevertheless--for reasons not fully clear--demonstrate a very high order of scholastic ability. It is such talented Negro students as these that Northern colleges have tended in the past and still tend to seek. There is little cause for concern over their adjustment to the academic requirements of college life.

During recent years, largely through the influence of the civil rights movement, a number of colleges have begun to admit Negro students whose academic records are no better and no worse than those of other applicants; and some institutions, operating on the compensatory principle, admit a few Negro students who are appraised as academic risks. Often these students perform unsatisfactorily in their courses, reflecting special problems to which college programs should be adjusted.

Some able Negro students do poorly in their studies because they allow academic responsibilities to be shunted aside by the glamorous new world of social activities available on the campus. Illustrative is one Ivy League observer's report on "a Negro boy who did not reach anywhere near his scholastic potential because he concentrated on becoming 'more Princeton than Princeton'--that is to say he was more conscious of the Princeton high-society type image than were most of his schoolmates."[2] There is speculation, but apparently little evidence, that a racial factor is here operative, that Negro students are especially vulnerable to the lure of superficial values which happen to be "in", largely because of their need to prove that they, too, "belong." It seems probable, however, that the sources of such behavior among Negro students and their need for helpful guidance are essentially the same as those of similarly disoriented white students.

This particular problem, of course, poses no threat to most Negro students, especially those from disadvantaged backgrounds; for their means are not commensurate with its demands. More commonly, their problems in the academic realm center around scholastic deficiencies stemming from inadequate preparation and aggravated by persistent poverty.

Given the economic and social discriminations which prevail in our society, especially the inferior elementary and secondary schools which most Negroes must attend, it is to be expected that relatively few Negro high school graduates apply for college admission with SAT scores around 600 or above. The fact that many colleges now accept Negro applicants with much lower scores reflects, in part, their desire for diversified student bodies. It also reflects growing recognition that projections from standard test scores commonly underestimate the potential of disadvantaged students, a fact widely demonstrated by their academic performance in college.[3]

Yet, it is only with real difficulty that many Negro students are able to perform satisfactorily in their courses. Their educational deficiencies are often substantial; even though their academic motivation is generally higher than that of most students,[4] many of them fail. More than a dull heave of the will is required to overcome the effects of long years of inadequate educational development.

The indicated need, of course, is a special program of educational services designed to help such students correct deficiencies which are known at the outset of exist. A few colleges are developing such programs, providing more than the usual tutoring services, remedial work, adjustment of course-loads, modification of freshman-year expectations, and the like. It appears, however, that most institutions take questionable pride in treating "all our students just alike," which is tantamount to repudiating a responsibility. As the Vice-President of the College

Entrance Examination Board has noted:

> To ask youngsters from depressed backgrounds to present the same credentials for admission as middle class youngsters is folly. To expect them to run the same race, to carry a normal academic load, to finish college in the normal term, to overcome the effects of deprivation quickly and catch up with their classmates is also folly . . . If colleges make allowances in their selection, as they must to admit disadvantaged youngsters, then they assume an obligation to make similar allowances in their education.[5]

Simple ignorance of campus culture leads some Negro students into academic difficulties which are avoided by classmates who "know the ropes." Illustrative is the marginal but enthusiastic freshman who fills his program with "tough" courses, a few of which he would be wise to defer. Illustrative also is the student who learns only too late that a course in which failure seems likely can be dropped without prejudice during the early weeks of the semester. Such difficulties, of course, beset unsophisticated students of any race. It just happens that proportionately more of the Negro students are uninformed about the coping techniques available.

There is also the special problem of ambivalence which many Negro students face in assessing their own academic achievement. Is he really performing badly, or is the teacher prejudiced? Could race be related to his getting a grade of C+ instead of a B-? The fact that such questions can arise reflects our general social pattern of discrimination against Negroes. Whether and how seriously they are posed depends in part upon objective circumstances, but also upon the types of defense mechanisms the individual student has developed.

Whether the Negro student's academic problem stems from inadequate preparation, lack of sophistication in managing his course-load, or ambivalence on the question of discrimination, it is likely that friendly guidance from interested and understanding members of the faculty could be helpful. Especially is this true in the case of disadvantaged Negro students, who probably have much greater need than other students for close personal relations with faculty.

Relevant in this connection is a careful study of the social mechanisms which lead middle class and lower class students to enter college. It was found that the former are influenced mainly by their families, and that the latter are influenced mainly by interested teachers.[6] It seems likely that there are similar social class differences in structural supports for academic success in college. If so, the impersonal student-faculty relationships which prevail at many institutions--and which students with strong familial supports may find tolerable--could pose an added handicap for disadvantaged students, many of whom lack such supports. Special measures may be in order to assure that such students develop close associations with understanding and empathetic members of the faculty.

The fact that many Negro students are poor, and thus able to attend college only with financial help, operates in several ways to aggravate their academic problems. In the first place, financial-aid students are almost always assigned jobs on the campus, requiring ten hours or more of work each week; but these students, perhaps more than any others, need all of their time for study and for enriching social experiences. Second, many institutions require a grade-average of "B" for maintenance of scholarships, which imposes quite a psychological burden upon educationally disadvantaged students, especially since there are no other financial resources upon which they can rely. This threat of failure is intensified by the fact that such students are often the first in their families to attend college. Third, some institutions require attendance in summer school to make up for courses failed during the regular academic year; but most disadvantaged students need urgently to earn money during the summer months. Fourth, one hears occasionally of disadvantaged Negro students quietly staying away from classes needlessly for such reasons as lack of money to replace broken eyeglasses or to obtain dental services to relieve acute pain. Help was readily available for the asking, but they could not afford the appearance of what they considered charity.

Although many institutions have modified their financial aid policies to help disadvantaged Negro students enter college, it appears that very few of them have modified such policies to help these students succeed once they are enrolled. That they do so would seem to be another indicated need. Financial aid policies which may be valid for most student often impose special handicaps upon disadvantaged students.

In this academic realm of experiences, as in other areas of campus life, there are at least three general guidelines which colleges would do well to heed. First, the big differences which obtain among individual Negro students call for differentiated approaches. Observed tendencies to think in terms of a "Negro student" category invite serious error. Second, many Negro students, because of limitations in their primary and secondary socialization, need special help in coping with the demands of college life. The college should assume this at the outset, adjusting its policies and practices accordingly. Third, the extent to which such students succeed in college affords a basis not only for assessing their behavior, but also for evaluating the institution's competence in the development of integrated education.

SOCIAL LIFE

Most, if not all, Negro students confront special problems of social adjustment in Northern colleges, whether their numbers are extremely small or substantial. Some of these problems stem from or are aggravated by apparent lack of sophistication in this area on the part of college officials. Others reflect distorted relationships which are commonplace in our racially-structured society.

There are at least a few colleges which brag quite a bit in public about how much they are doing to help the "disadvantaged Negro student," not realizing--one most assume--the negative effect of such inept behavior upon their students. Negro students, usually a tiny minority, tend to become more than ordinarily self-conscious; and they resent being exploited for public relations purposes. White students tend to equate "disadvantaged" with "Negro," which implies an affront to Negro students who are affluent, and a stigma for those who are poor. The net result is increased isolation of the Negro students. It seems elementary that a college should make the entrance of Negro students as unobtrusive as possible.

Negro women students at a number of colleges have been offended by clumsy handling of the room-assignment question. One such entering student, for example, knowing how few Negroes attended the institution, expected to be paired with a white roommate, and she was. She was hurt and annoyed, however, when she learned that the college had informed her roommate that she would be living with a Negro, but had not told her that she would be living with a white student. Approached by an outsider on this question, the institution defended its practice as a means of avoiding unpleasant incidents on the first day of school. Assuming benevolence of purpose, however, the college's behavior was objectively discriminatory, and harmful in its results. If the question had to be raised at all, which is questionable, the institution might better have sent each freshman certain descriptive information about her prospective roommate--such as name and address (which is generally routine), together with high school attended, probable major in college, race, hobbies, and possibly religion.

Incidentally, it appears that there still are a few Northern colleges that "solve" this problem through the crudely discriminatory practice of rooming all Negro students together, or as singles, especially in the case of women.

Dating usually poses a substantial problem for Negro students at predominantly white colleges. This is especially true for Negro women students, who cannot appropriately initiate interracial dating contacts. Whereas Negro men often pass them by and date white women, white men, especially freshmen, are hesitant to date Negro women. Moreover, some Negro women report that their parents do not want them to date interracially. The result is a pretty bleak social life for some Negro women students.

Although this problem is less acute with Negro men students, it is not at all uncommon among them. Largely because of past racist experiences, some Negro men hesitate to ask a white woman for a date and tend to be uncomfortable when they do have an interracial dating experience. White women students, also responding to persistent patterns of our culture, often avoid Negro men and sometimes rebuff their direct approaches. Besides, often there are no or very few Negro women around for them to date. This general set of circumstances probably goes far toward explaining why an all-Negro "Yale Discussion Group" was organized to plan and conduct an annual "week-end," when Negro students from nearby prestige women's colleges are brought to New Haven for some formal discussions and--more than coincidentally--a heavy round of social activities.

In areas of campus social life apart from dating, sensitive

Negro students are often made aware of subtle as well as overt prejudices among their fellow-students. Both rejection and over-solicitation are among their manifestations; and, as Clark has generalized:

> Some Negro students will seek to protect themselves by withdrawing from the anticipated hurts of interracial contacts; others will withdraw from their fellow Negro students in search of some protection in a delusionary world of denial of racial problems, repressing overt evidence of racial rejection; others will look for comfort and a temporary form of racial pride by a racial nationalism which in fact seeks to weld a small group of their fellow Negro students into a segregated Negro cabal on the campus.[7]

It is frequently noted with surprise that Negro students in Northern colleges tend to be apathetic about civil rights struggles in which many of their white fellow-students are actively involved. Illustrative is a Negro woman student who said she did not want to belong to CORE or NAACP; she wanted to be in Little Theatre, and she wished they would let her alone. Further illustrative is the Negro male student who expressed resentment over the fact that white students sought him out only when some "Negro issue" was involved, but never on more general campus questions. What appears to be apathy regarding civil rights issues is undoubtedly just that in the case of some Negro students; but in most cases the apathy is perhaps more apparent than real. It may reflect rejection of tendencies toward the social compartmentalization of Negro students. Perhaps it is a distorted form of struggle for recognition as an individual human being.

Some observers who are familiar with Northern colleges report that the quality of interracial social life on the campus is generally improved when token numbers of Negro students are supplanted by substantial Negro enrollments. They say, for example, that one or two--or even 10 or 12--Negro students among 800 or 1,000 white students tend to feel self-conscious and isolated; white students tend to perceive and behave toward them as "strangers," to be overly welcomed or ignored. Larger numbers of Negroes at such a small college--say, 40 or 50, or about five percent--tend to create a more relaxed social atmosphere for everyone. Negro students are less likely to feel responsible for carrying the whole burden of "representing the race," and white students are less likely to feel a need to be over-friendly with them because they are Negroes. Interracial associations and friendships are more likely to develop out of shared interests, rather than because a well-meaning white student wants to have "a Negro friend." Moreover, Negro students are freer to associate or not to associate with one another, on the basis of personal likes and dislikes, than when they constitute a tiny minority.

It seems reasonable that such reported relationships between the number of Negroes on campus and the quality of social life should obtain. Further, if there be a "tipping-point" beyond which there are important negative concommitants of increased Negro enrollments, no private liberal arts college in the North is anywhere near it.

Just what college officials should do to promote genuinely integrated social relations among white and Negro students is less clear-cut and specific than in the case of academic life. One guideline, surely, is to avoid embarrassing Negro students and distorting the perceptions of white students by giving undue public notice of the Negroes' presence. Many of them need special help, but it should be given as a matter of course--without either patronizing over-attentiveness or severe aloofness. Another is to be less cautious about arrangements for interracial living in the dormitory. It is probable that all but very few students have long since developed beyond the need for gingerly approaches to this question. As for the more informal associations among students, direct official intervention probably should be restricted to cases of overt discrimination. Even so, the administration can help create favorable conditions for the development of integrated social life by admitting substantial numbers of Negro students. It can also help set a positive tone for social life on the campus through an official posture which is thoroughly democratic and unambiguous on related questions of general policy.

SPIRITUAL LIFE

The Afro-American Society at Columbia University recently launched a provocative little journal called The Black Student,[8] and its editors introduce the publication with the statement: "There is an identity crisis among Black students in America."

> Simply stated, American universities do not prepare us to cope with our problems in as adequate a manner as it seemingly prepares white students to cope with theirs. It does not satisfactorily ameliorate for Black students

> a critical problem of our own generation; that is, white society has dictated the terms of our acceptance into the American mainstream. To us, these terms are unacceptable. Therefore, we are now questioning the adequacy of present American standards as a means of attaining our self-fulfillment.

This "crisis of identity" goes to the core of what we here call problems in the spiritual life of Negro students. It stems from the seemingly inescapable conflict between accommodation to or radical assault against the prevailing structure and processes of American society. Essentially it is the search for an acceptable meaning of life as a Negro. At stake is validation of self in a world whose dominant values negate the worth and dignity of Negro-ness. It defines an area of experience in relation to which Northern colleges are least adequately equipped to help their Negro students--and perhaps even to comprehend.

This identity problem, of course, is not merely a student phenomenon; in one way or another it affects the whole Negro people. On the campus, it is most clearly articulated by a minority of militant Negro students in several Ivy League and Sister colleges--especially Harvard, Radcliffe, Yale, Princeton and Columbia. But there are many evidences of its impact on other students.

The most dramatic manifestation of the problem is in the behavior of those Negro students who are openly at war with the "white world." They tend strongly toward Negro nationalism, often embracing the Black Muslim outlook. They scorn fellow-students who cherish goals of affluence and respectability in some corporate or other position far removed from the problems of the Negro masses. Commonly they reject the term "Negro" as a badge of inferiority assigned by the white man, preferring to call themselves "Afro-Americans." And there is a recent tendency among them to form separate organizations of Negro students on the campus.

This "duality problem" is also manifested--less dramatically, and perhaps less healthfully--in the tendency of many Negro students to withdraw from everything Negro. They are preoccupied with seeking acceptance "as an individual, not as a Negro." They pointedly refuse to get involved in civil rights struggles. And they sometimes avoid associating with other Negro students.

The militant expression of this identity crisis among Negro students is related to the spiritual turmoil being experienced during this period by many thoughtful white students, who also are trying desperately to find acceptable meaning for their lives. The fundamental answer for both lies in some basic restructuring of our culture; and this, of course, is beyond the capabilities of the college. But it is not irrelevant to the college's mission.

The approaches through which Northern colleges might help Negro students to resolve affirmatively their problem of personal validity as Negroes are not so simple as those through which help can be given in the related areas of academic and social life. Indeed, they call for major changes in the thinking and programs of these institutions.

Administration and faculty would need to get en rapport with the main currents of Negro life, about which most of them know very little. They would need to re-evaluate and redefine many areas of curriculum content, to the end of correcting important errors of commission and omission regarding the history, characteristics and role of the nation's largest minority group. They would need publicly to involve their institutions--at least intellectually--on the side of the "Negro revolution," which is emerging as a major political force in the country. And, perhaps most fundamental, they would need to permeate the whole of college life, in classroom and on campus, with an ideology of genuine respect for all peoples and social classes.

The authors well understand that very few Northern colleges are yet prepared to take these steps. Those which do, or even try, will thereby help greatly to further the academic, social and spiritual life of all their students. Positive accomplishments along this line will not only enhance the quality of integrated higher education; they will also advance the cause of freedom in the nation.

NOTES

1. Grateful acknowledgment is made to members of the professional staff of the National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students for many of the accounts and insights upon which this analysis is based.

2. Charles Puttkammer, "Negroes in the Ivy League," unpublished manuscript, 1961-62, p.55.

3. See, for example, Kenneth B. Clark and Lawrence Plotkin, The Negro Student at Integrated Colleges, National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students, 1963, pp. 15-22.

4. Ibed., pp. 18-19.

5. John M. Duggan, "Evaluating the Disadvantaged Student," ACAC Journal, Summer, 1965, pp. 14-17.

6. Robert A. Ellis and W. Clayton Lane, "Structural Supports for Upward Mobility," American Sociological Review, 28: 743-756, October 1963.

7. Kenneth B. Clark, "The Negro Student in Northern Interracial Colleges: An Overview, "The Black Student, 1: 2-8, Spring 1966.

8. Afro-American Society, Columbia University, The Black Student, Volume I, Number 1, Spring 1966.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND THE UNIVERSITY--PHASE TWO: THE INTEGRATED CAMPUS

Lawrence C. Howard
Marc Lee

It is time for the civil rights movement to find its permanent place in American society. With the exception of a few pockets of resistance in the South, phase one of the civil rights revolution is over. The dramatic and moral power of the demonstrations, the sit-ins, the picketing, and the marches has been felt in Washington and has been assimilated in the form of legislation. A Presidential campaign was won and a domestic policy instituted on the basis of faith in that power. The leader of phase one, Martin Luther King, must be counted among the 20 most respected men in the world. In five years, phase one has achieved great successes, but it is only the coccoon; the real butterfly--the integrated society--is years off and almost totally overlooked in the brilliance and fervor of the last few battles in the hard-core segregationist areas, North and South.

Phase two, a plan for the integrated society, must be invoked now while there is momentum, or the tremendous amount of moral energy generated by the marches and demonstrations will be bottled up in anti-climatic calls for moderation and circumlocutions about the need to proceed slowly or before the full momentum of the white backlash takes hold. Both will require only the smallest spark to cause an explosion. Now is not the time to slow down but to shift gears and really get somewhere. There is no reason why the next 20 years should not be fully as productive in the social sphere as have been the last five.

To suggest, however, that a plan for an integrated society is already programmed out in some fantastic computer is totally misleading. There is no such plan and only the vaguest conception exists of what an integrated society will be like. Every step we take in housing, employment, and particularly education seems to get slogged in the mire of 300 years of human failure. Every summer the sum of energy wasted in violence in northern cities seems greater. The drive towards an integrated society has, at present, only three resources: first, the example already set by the civil rights workers in the South, a testimony of the beauty and moral potency of integration, on a small scale, as a way of life; second, the assurance that the federal government is committed to the goal of an integrated society, that the "Great Society" is to be an integrated society; third, the knowledge slowly coming to life within most of us that the one truly valuable and characteristic American experience is the confrontation of the races, that creative American contributions are a direct result of that confrontation, and that the truly American contribution in other fields, mainly psychology and the social sciences, will likewise derive from a fuller confrontation if we could but move on toward integration.

There is a fourth resource, though it is almost completely untapped: the American university. In order to begin to formulate a plan for integration there must be a place to experiment, a place where human activity can be viewed more objectively than in the business community or our own neighborhoods. The civil rights revolution has been largely unorganized and spontaneous while American society in general is highly organized. Therefore, a plan for an integrated society will have to be initiated in a place where integration can begin to take root in more and more sophisticated groups that have more functions and more diversity than the civil rights groups we have seen to date. The university is the best place fot this transition to be made, because it is the only place in our society with the right balance of organization and spontaneity.

The need for the American university to become the sanctuary of the civil rights movement comes at a rather inopportune time when most major universities are simultaneously confronted with unprecedented demands for mass education, expansion, and research. The time, it seems, is coming quickly when the university will no longer be able to be a sanctuary for anything quite so unsophisticated as the civil rights movement. We have on the sites of most northern state universities what Clark Kerr calls the "multiversity," the youngest brother of that venerable threesome, Big Government, Big Labor, and Big Industry. The incompatibility of bigness and civil rights is dramatized most clearly in the activities of many students on large northern campuses. In many cases, the students who have voiced dismay at the impersonality of the campus and university materialism displayed in concern for grants and the prestige of publication are the same students who have become active in civil rights, perhaps in search of the humanity and idealism that they failed to find in campus life and as an antidote to the impersonality and materialism that they did find.

By and large, this civil rights activity leads them off campus to the nearby Negro community or into the South. Primarily, this activity is viewed with a cold eye by the university administration. Student cries of "de-humanization" and discrimination are not easy to accept on the administration level if high-level university officers agree, and a good number do, that the university must do something in the realm of civil rights. Many times the administration's hand is forced by trustees, legislatures, and financial contributors who instinctively brand activist students as trouble-makers and, more commonly, as Communists. Lines become quickly hardened, with the professors usually caught in the middle, sympathizing with the moral fervor and idealism of the students but also recognizing the realities of the administration's position. However, professors tend to feel that their scholarly pursuits are more important than siding actively with one faction or the other unless the situation, as at Berkeley, comes to a head.

When the divisive and disintegrating aspects of the civil rights question are seen, one of two things usually happens on the administrative level. The administration can decide to gracefully abandon the sphere of civil rights by issuing a statement from the office of the president supporting the ends but not the means of the civil rights movement. It can then undertake the role of campus policeman to make sure that the activist students don't get too active and that they engage in their civil rights activity off campus, preferably during the summer when the school has no responsibility for them. Or, like the University of Wisconsin, it can decide to take a long, hard look at the whole question of civil rights to see if it could not come up with a more unified, total-university response.

The first unavoidable conclusion from such a look is that the university must clean its own house before it can honestly undertake a position of leadership in civil rights. The recognition by an administration that something must be done on its own campus dovetails with the students' response to civil rights, the response that compels the student to leave the campus in order to feel he is really involved in civil rights.

What an earnest administration soon discovers is that, in spite of a non-discriminatory admission policy, there are few if any Negroes on the campus. The statistics are embarrassing for a school that would like to honestly consider itself in the mainstream of American social change. Further, the school usually discovers that the few Negroes on hand have great difficulty and either drop out or flunk out before they finish their four years. The northern university, in spite of the advances in remediation and teaching techniques, is simply unequipped to educate non-middle class students.

Since it is obvious that Negro students frequently are ill-prepared to do college work, someone in the university community is assigned the task of investigating the local high schools to see what is wrong. The high school teachers point to the grammar schools; the grammar schools blame the home environment; the parents deplore employment and housing restrictions; realtors blame the white home owners, and employers blame the university. Whatever university agency is involved in this Gordian Knot of urban and racial problems then logically advises the university to sponsor various projects in a crash program to produce, within anywhere from two to ten years, a certain number of Negro high school seniors who are ready to do college level work. Federal grant money, and often state money, is readily available for such projects, because the government is committed to the same end. Often university projects can be worked into existing government undertakings: the Job Corps, Upward Bound, the anti-poverty program, or urban redevelopment.

For several reasons, however, these trouble shooting projects often turn out to be unsatisfactory. From a practical point of view, they do not seem to generate the kind of enthusiasm among the students and professors that one might expect from activities that evolve directly out of the civil rights movement, that are, hopefully, motivated by a vision of an integrated society that the university community could take pride in helping to fulfill. University people are just not willing to spend their time and energy on such projects.

The students might say, what is the point of bringing such and suc a number of Negroes onto a campus that even the white students consider impersonal if not hostile? Professors often feel that they are already spreading their time too thinly between research, a projected leave-of-absence, a graduate seminar, and the book they have to publish. In the face of such apathy, the administration that sponsored the projects often decides to disown them. They are hard to defend to the legislature at budget time along with the university's many other requirements. Alumni disapproval is likely to become violent. The administration reappraises its position and decides that it really has no business undertaking projects in the community anyway, that this is an area beyond its influence and control. The longer such projects operate the more the university seems to look like a branch of the federal government, confirming in administration officials' minds the truth of Clark Kerr's terrifying statement: "The university has become a prime instrument of national purpose." At this point, the administration is likely to get cold feet, leaving the agency that was created to run the projects their only defender.

Again, the administration's feeling seems to coincide with the student's, though it is not the spectre of government control, or Socialism, or 1984 that repels the students. It is simply that the problem-solving, government-style projects do little to soften the already disheartening bureaucracy of the campus and might create even more extracurricular diversions. They would rather stick to their own brand of civil rights activity, because civil rights is a personal affair to them, not a set of statistics. The students might agree with the administration's intention of cleaning its own house. But what the projects boil down to is simply adding Negroes to an already intolerable situation on large university campuses. If the projects have any effect on campus life, it is probably a negative one: more financial reports, budgets, IBM cards, and more faces, now both black and white, lost in the crowd. Students who have been active in civil rights know that the essence of their sacrifice to civil rights, is not the night spent in a southern jail house, or the postponement of their studies, but that they have allowed their lives and outlook to be changed. They want to see the same sacrifice on the part of the administration. They know instinctively that no university really committed to civil rights could ever remain impersonal and materialistic in their eyes. Perhaps it is that spontaneous spirit that is missing from the administrations' approach, a spirit that learns as well as teaches and allows change in itself as it changes others. Presidents Kennedy and Johnson brought that spirit to their realm; so have Congress, the advertising industry, and organized baseball; to a lesser extent, so have the business community and the church. Students have been moved by that spirit in the South and in the big-city-slums, but not on the university campus.

This may sound like fuzzy-headed and ill-directed criticism, offering no alternative, but the reaction is honestly felt and is not likely to be altered.

The point is that the two kinds of responses to civil rights that have come out of the university community, the students' exodus to the Negro ghettos and the South and the government style projects, have both failed to achieve the kind of balance between spontaneity and organization that is the present need of the civil rights movement and is so natural to university life: in the classroom, in living groups, in athletics, and student government. The question of civil rights seems to be an added drain on administration resources, an added burden for faculty, and, almost inevitably, a call for students to leave the campus, rather than something which thrives quite naturally in the university setting. Somehow, the link that would unite all the qualities of university life in a response to civil rights seems to be missing.

The above account, though generalized, has been roughly the experience of the University of Wisconsin. Sensitive people on UW's two big campuses, at Madison and Milwaukee, felt something to be missing from the university's role in civil rights and integration. They sensed that whatever was done, on whatever university level, tended to be unilateral, exclusive of the other levels, and self-defeating, rather than expansive and self-generating.

In order to find a formula for a more comprehensive approach and one not so apparently alien to university life, Wisconsin established the Committee on Cooperation with Negro Universities (CCNU) with the function of defining and instituting an effective relationship with Negro universities in the South. With such a relationship, the University hoped to absorb civil rights with its spirit and spontaneity intact, yet in a state which would not be immediately rejected by the organizational structure of a university community. In effect, the Negro university or college offered civil rights in a university setting, "domesticated" for the purposes of a university.

That the connection between the university's role in civil rights and Negro schools had not been made sooner is not surprising. Since Reconstruction, when Negro colleges were established under the "separate, but equal" philosophy, they have existed in almost total obscurity, a shadow in the American system of higher education. They were never a part of the university establishment, whose professors appeared on the editorial staffs of professional journals and whose presidents were honored members of society. They were, and still are to a great extent, the forgotten end of American education. In fact, prior to the establishing of the CCNU, we in Wisconsin hardly knew that a system of Negro higher education existed.

We discovered how democratic America had colleges that were not in the mainstream of higher education, how America had preserved these schools in a state which would be almost unrecognizable to anyone whose contact with university life had been limited to the large state universities of the North. There was nothing like the affluence of northern schools. The buildings on Negro campuses were attractive enough, but laboratories and libraries turned out to be either absent or inadequate. It was no surprise to discover that Negro schools received .74 percent of federal research grants. On the other hand, we found to our surprise that teaching and student-teacher contact was emphasized at Negro schools in a day when teaching seems to be a mere by-product of our northern university's research factory, something assigned to graduate assistants and lower-echelon faculty.

We began to feel that the Negro colleges of the South had managed to avoid the evils of the large state universities of the North, but that many of the advantages of the northern schools had not been adopted in the South.

A closer look at Negro higher education did not present a pleasant picture. The prestige of the Negro schools is low. From an economic or professional point of view, a degree from a southern Negro college has little value in the white community. Perhaps 60 percent of the Negroes who attend college attend the 123 predominantly Negro colleges and universities. Graduates are severely limited to a few professions which can be practiced in the Negro community. Almost 50 percent of the students, and almost all the women, are preparing to teach, with most education majors destined for employment in de facto segregated public school systems.

Our conversations with students and a review of the limited literature suggested that many Negro students discover sooner or later that their professors, with extremely heavy teaching loads, are often unable to keep up with the newest developments in their fields. It appeared that an average of only 30 percent of the faculty had Ph.D.'s, yet other students reported that the Negro college had what they sought, and was their choice even though white state institutions were also available. The Negro freshmen, themselves, are ill-prepared and find college-level work difficult. The average reading level, for instance, of all freshmen entering Negro schools is said to be about at the tenth grade level and ranges in some cases down to seventh grade norms. A 50 percent dropout rate level results in widespread disillusionment among Negro college students. Professors, able to create little intellectual excitement among their students, also become disillusioned when they realize that they spend half their time teaching at a high school level. Yet much educational development does take place and these schools almost invariably have some alumni with distinguished records.

Nonetheless, this mixed picture was qualitatively lower than the popular conception of American higher education. For 100 years, Negro colleges have been almost totally ignored by white higher

4

education and have been systematically starved of resources. However, in 1963, light was thrown on the shadowy southern Negro colleges in a paper by Samuel Nabrit of Texas Southern University, Steve White of Educational Service, and Jerrald Zacharias of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. They gained President Kennedy's endorsement of the idea that it was the duty of American higher education as a whole to save the Negro colleges from their plight. Their first step was to set up summer long institutes for Negro faculty on several northern campuses, one discipline per campus, to bring Negro faculty up to date on current teaching techniques and research. The Carnegie Corporation financed an institution in mathematics at the University of Wisconsin, physics at Princeton, biology at the University of North Carolina, history at Carnegie Tech, and English at Indiana University. In the fall of 1964, an appraisal meeting was held at M.I.T. The delegation from the University of Wisconsin criticized the way the institutes were run. First of all, they said, the "big brother" image was too strongly projected. The institutes tended to emphasize the deficiencies revealed by Negro faculty and consequently were self-defeating. Only with minor exceptions were the institute staffs open to pioneering efforts aimed to capitalize on the strengths that institute participants brought--hence the thought that their students might have promise had no occasion to arise. The results at Wisconsin were disheartening: only two of the 50 who attended the math institute could be recommended for graduate study.

The university wanted to do better.

As a result of its critical appraisal, Wisconsin was read out of the program and the inner circle planning to rennovate the predominantly Negro colleges. Wisconsin, however, was not ready to abandon the institute idea as unsalvageable. In fact, Wisconsin had conducted the institute two successive summers on its own. Wisconsin simply felt that the institutes, as they stood, were an inadequate device for a productive relationship with Negro colleges.

By the fall of 1964, the CCNU was beginning to see another possibility for a much fuller relationship with Negro colleges. Three southern Negro colleges, North Carolina College in Durham, North Carolina A & T in Greensboro, and Texas Southern University in Houston were asked to join Wisconsin in a cooperative project. In June, Wisconsin received a $300,000 Carnegie Corporation grant. Immediately, $80,000 was released to each of the three schools to use as they saw fit. It was decided in light of the unsuccessful summer institutes that a good deal of knowledge about the four schools had to be assembled before anything definite could be undertaken. Each of the southern schools was asked to assess its own weaknesses during the summer of '64 and make recommendations for its needs for the program. At the same time, representatives from UW were sent on reconnaisance trips to each of the southern schools. The reports and recommendations of the three southern schools can be roughly condensed as follows:

The southern schools saw their overall problem as inadequate prestige. A prestige-poor college is usually caught in a cycle of fewer applications, and consequently lower standards. For a state-supported college (as the three are) to have to contend with lower enrollment and lower standards is an impossible situation. In the first case, state financial support can be withdrawn; in the second, there is the threat of losing accreditation. None of the three schools thought itself in immediate danger of losing accreditation, but southern state legislatures are always unpredictable in the area of Negro college allocations. The three schools realized that the quickest and surest road to added prestige was more Ph.D.'s on their faculties. Their primary recommendation for exchange was to send faculty to Wisconsin for degree-study. North Carolina College set aside 70 percent of its grant money for this purpose. Plans were made for UW to enroll between six and nine faculty members in UW graduate study in the fall of 1965. As a corollary to this recommendation, the schools asked for UW graduate students to come south to fill the faculty spots thus vacated. Seventeen UW graduate students were released for teaching at TSU in the fall; six at NCC, and eventually two at A & T.

Southern school officials saw their next big weakness as poor motivation and unscholarly attitudes among both students and faculty. Though this was due mainly to ill-preparedness and the great difficulty of college-level work for many of the students, a motivational boost could come from the presence of UW teachers and student tutors in the classrooms. Distinguished professors and even graduate students from UW could also be a great stimulus to Negro professors. The three schools seemed reluctant to ask for student exchanges on a large scale, however, since they felt that only a few of their students were capable of doing UW work.

The southern schools also welcomed the suggestions of UW administrative and management officials. TSU felt that its intra-university communication was poor and that the chain of command could use clarification. All three schools felt in general, that simple application of Wisconsin's strengths in almost every sector of university life and work would go a long way towards solving their problems.

By the middle of 1965, it was becoming increasingly clear that the recommendations of the southern schools far from exhausted the possibilities of a cooperative effort by the four schools. First, the CCNU was beginning to see strengths that had been totally unexpected in the three schools and were in areas of great interest to Wisconsin. Remediation is probably the best example. Obviously, with freshmen entering at an average reading level of tenth grade, remedial and pre-college programs are of great importance to Negro colleges. Among the three schools, there were already in operation 12 remedial and pre-college programs, the latter focusing primarily on the summer before the freshman year. Wisconsin, with admitted difficulties in educating students from urban high schools, could unquestionably profit in its relatively new remedial and pre-college programs from the experience of the Negro schools.

Second, the Negro schools seemed generally to view the proposal from Wisconsin to join in the cooperation as a request for an exchange. The sum total of their firm recommendations included little more than relatively short exchanges of faculty for graduate students, with a few students spending their junior year "abroad" in Madison for as long as the grant money lasted. Exchange programs had been successfully begun between Brown and Tougaloo, Michigan and Tuskegee, and Indiana and Stillman, among others. It was a mistake for the schools cooperating with Wisconsin to view the program as simply a transaction of people filling slots on one campus vacated by people from the other. Only after people from the four campuses had been together for awhile and had begun to discuss common interests could ideas for cooperation even begin to take shape. Integration, the mixing of races and backgrounds, would be a new experience for almost everyone at the four schools. The final form of such a cooperative effort could not be predicted, programmed, and budgeted before the fundamental act, integration had been consummated.

However, there was already an indication of what the project could ultimately be: Project English Sequence, a cooperative undertaking between the four schools. This is an attempt to find new ways of dealing with the difficulties of teaching composition, the _sine-qua non_ of all education, to students with poor linguistic backgrounds. To many of these students, the academic, literary language of college and professional writing is nothing more or less than a foreign language. Part of the approach is to teach composition with second language teaching techniques, newly developed and successfully used by the Peace Corps. No one knows what the result will be. However, there is every indication that new developments in teaching composition growing out of this project will be equally applicable to freshmen from Milwaukee's sixth ward or south side and to those of the Negro ghetto of Charlotte, North Carolina.

Viewed imaginatively, the cooperative project could be exactly what Wisconsin had been searching for as the proper response to the civil rights movement, at all three levels of the university community. It was a way of domesticating the civil rights movement to fit into the context of the university campus--student exchanges, for instance. The southern schools expressed fears of a cultural lag in even their best students, were they to come to Wisconsin. Yet, it was students from North Carolina A & T who organized the first student sit-ins in Greensboro back in 1960, often viewed as the beginning of the entire civil rights movement in the South. It was conceivable that many Wisconsin students would view exchange students as cultural heroes or at least direct descendants of cultural heroes. These exchange students might be "culturally disadvantaged" in some areas--opera, perhaps, or sports car mechanics--but in some others it was Wisconsin students who would consider themselves "disadvantaged."

Many professors in the behavioral sciences, as they begin to realize the ultimate consequences of the civil rights movement, recognize the need for research in integration studies. The civil rights movement will end in an integrated society. Yet most sociology departments, for example, have more information on hand about the cultural patterns of East African tribes than they do about the cultural patterns in the Negro ghettos of their own cities. Beyond that, there are vast areas of research in how integration will affect us, what an integrated society will be like, that are almost totally untouched. To these scholars, new knowledge in almost any phase of the behavioral sciences which is not arrived at from an integrated point of view, by integrated teams of researchers, is, by that fact, rendered obsolete and useless. This is the motivation behind Project English Sequence, but other possibilities are virtually countless. A new look at American history is already underway in public schools. Areas of American culture where Negroes have made significant contributions--music, athletics, come immediately to mind--need to be fed by college-level research. Almost every academic department could probably profit by some sort of exchange, in research or in teaching, with its counterpart on one of the Negro campuses.

In short, it was the ultimate aim of the University of Wisconsin in initiating this project, to become a living laboratory of integration. UW was committed to the belief that the only possible American society of the future is an integrated society. To that end it aimed; first, to establish a microcosm of that society on its own campuses as quickly as possible; second, to describe that society in the detail of scholarship and the fullness of the arts so that the integration of society as a whole will not have to proceed in darkness and fear of the unknown, so that mistakes will not have to be repeated and successes will never go unnoticed.

To have the Civil Rights movement find its permanent place on a northern university campus required Wisconsin to bring on its campuses far more Negro students, faculty and administration in one year than it had been able to hire or graduate in its entire history. And this change further required drastic alteration in its instructional research and extension programs to make them relevant to the interests that these new elements would bring. The life of the student on campus, especially its extra curricular phases, would have to receive far more attention than ever before, for the task would be nothing less than intelligently planning for Negroes and whites to learn to live together, sharing as completely and as intelligently as possible. The university would have the task of showing America how joyful and productive integrated living can and must be.

The resources for such a commitment seemed to be at hand. Regular contact, university to university, white to black was established. Funds were in hand to bring to the North the needed black students, administration and faculty--and sending whites in the same categories to the South. The intellectual resources for understanding the requirements for integration could easily be tapped from the resources and students of these institutions. North and South seemed eager to share of each other.

The grand design never was tried--we in Wisconsin remained unwilling to accept our own need. Instead we gazed south, careful not to offend our Negro colleges with too frank an appraisal. We offered them help which really consisted of not becoming involved and sending our second rate.

Hopefully, somewhere within the life of the University of Wisconsin, greater courage can be found. Only through the Carnegie grant and the CCNU have we had the opportunity to encounter Negroes in the university setting. Phase one is over--phase two, the demonstration of what civil rights is like, must now proceed because America never more desperately needed it. The university is an excellent place to begin. Our pursuit of this task may help us find our way to our own students.

TRANSFORMING THE DEVELOPING, USES OF TRAINING TECHNOLOGY, AND COOPERATIVE ARRANGEMENTS WITH BUSINESS

Charles W. Slack
Educational Consultant
Montclair, New Jersey

The following paper presents my own ideas and does not represent the Westinghouse Electric and Learning Corporations or any other of my clients.

There are two points that I want to make. The first is about educational technology and training. It strikes me that the difference between the institutions we are talking about, the so-called established and developed institutions, is as much a matter of training as of education. In other words, if an exchange student from Miles College does not do well at the University of Michigan, it may be because he has not been trained in certain things such as how to study or how to read. On the other hand, if someone from the University of Wisconsin goes down to a predominantly Negro school in the South, he too must be trained as we train the Peace Corps or anyone who comes from one culture and undertakes sustained living in another. These things are not necessarily higher education, but they're some facts of life.

The other point is that there are interesting opportunities for real hybrids offered by interinstitutional cooperation. Unfortunately, people are mainly talking about relations between a college and a university, while relations between developing colleges and institutions outside of higher education, such as the business community, might be much more productive.

We have developed in this country, largely outside higher education, a rapidly expanding training technology. This consists of things like self-instruction materials and classroom management systems. These enable people to be trained in things without the necessity for the presence of a teacher. Most of these systems work on self-pacing principles, as the individual student proceeds at his own rate through the material. I don't pretend that these systems satisfy all the requirements for education, but they are the best and most efficient way to train people to overcome certain blocks or problems. If you want to teach English as a second language, or middle class English as a second language to lower class English speakers, or if you want to teach somebody to read in a matter of a month instead of years, you use the new automated educational technology. I'm not suggesting this technology should be substituted for the faculties of universities, although I do believe that any teacher who can be replaced by a computer ought to be, but I feel there is a possibility for making a much wider use of instructional technology. It comes largely from the military and from industry, from outside higher learning.

Here are some of the things we could do. On the student level, we can legitimately raise the I.Q.'s of people. Remember that the people with high I.Q.'s are those who become trained in a question and answer world. There may be genetic factors present in the I.Q., but these could be compensated for by training. There isn't any reason why a course can't be developed which would sample all the possible items from which the Stanford-Binet or S.A.T. items are a sub-sample. With new computerized instruction or self-instruction methods, a student could be trained on all those items in a few months thus legitimately raising his I.Q. You wouldn't be cheating in just training him on the whole sample or some portion of it.

Certainly, through the new technology we can teach youngsters from deprived backgrounds to read and write English or other languages very rapidly. I don't mean we can teach them to write fine prose, but creative writing may also be largely a matter of training. The major difficulty for the teacher of creative writing is the students' lack of preparation in the basics. What I am talking about is bringing students up to an equal level in the basics by using this new training technology.

The possibilities I am mentioning here are already being proved. In the Job Corps, for example, we get reading gain rates of over a year per month, and mathematics gain rates of over eight months per month using programed instruction--and these students are high school drop-outs. When we try to mix the university student with the so-called developing student, the possibilities of applying these new technologies expand.

The other interesting hybrid is the possibility of a mix between American industry and the predominantly Negro colleges. The values which predominate in the small Negro college are pretty much those of the industrial middle class managerial substrata, in contrast, for example, to the values of Berkeley activists and Harvard undergraduates. In addition, there is now a demand on the part of industry for Negro managers, to keep both the workers and the customers happy.

Another possibility is for American industry to enter the education business. In addition to traditional student fellowship or work-study programs, there could be a very exciting exchange of faculty and personnel between a company like Westinghouse Learning and an institution like Miles. In other words, I would like to see some Miles people come and work for Westinghouse Learning, or G.E., or I.B.M., or S.R.A., and I would like to see some of the Westinghouse Computer people go down and teach at Miles. In such a trade, the corporation would be, to some extent, exploiting Miles, and I wouldn't have it any other way. We would be getting more out of it than they would. I think that's only right, because we're a profit making organization and they're not. What the colleges could get out of it might include information on such things as management systems and styles and cost accounting procedures. On the other hand, one of the developing colleges could clue a Westinghouse or an I.B.M. into the nature of its market.

I'd like to end my projections on what I think that market is going to be. I feel it too, is going to be a hybrid. The future of education, it seems to me, rests in a combination of technology and interpersonal relations, (someone has called this the science-soul mix). This is going to pay off when we get the drudgery of training out of the way by means of automation and then let this marvelous interpersonal process which goes on between the dedicated teacher and student go on between any teacher in the world and any student in the world.

THE CASE FOR CONCENTRATING TITLE III FUNDS ON THE PREDOMINANTLY NEGRO COLLEGES

Michael J. Horowitz

A critical policy question in the administration of the Title III program is the extent to which the predominantly Negro colleges represent a particularly meritorious class of schools which deserve special Title III priorities as opposed to other developing institutions of a comparable character, mostly denominational in nature. In my judgment, there is no question but that they do. On the other hand, the Title III office strongly disagrees and insists that no such "favoritism" will be shown.

A number of points are worth noting. For one, Title III is in principal, part of an outgrowth of the Gardner Task Force Report of 1964, whose excellence in suggesting educational priorities was sufficient to persuade the President that John Gardner was the best man to become the secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In that report, Gardner suggested that the predominantly Negro colleges represent a unique class of institutions in need of increased support and capable of achieving real growth if given sufficient aid. As president of the Carnegie Foundation, John Gardner was a remarkable innovative figure, being responsible for implementing the report of Doctors Samuel Nabrit, Stephen Wright and Jerrold Zacharias, a key document which led to the formation of the "Ad Hoc" committee of the American Council on Education and later to much of the support of the predominantly Negro colleges. It was the thesis of the Gardner report, later supported by the important study of Earl McGrath, a former Commissioner of Education and now professor at Teachers College, that anything short of full-scale support for the predominantly Negro colleges would cost the nation at least a full generation of college trained Negro leaders. Dr. McGrath's report was financed by Carnegie. His findings are instructive:

> Deliberate weighing of the evidence in this study leads to the conclusion that most of the predominantly Negro institutions ought to be preserved and strengthened. In any event, none should be allowed to die unless and until their present and prospective students can be assured of better educational opportunities elsewhere. The closing of (even) the weaker institutions would deprive thousands of Negro youth of any opportunity for higher education.

Should there be Negro colleges? Are such institutions vestiges of a segregated system and doomed to multiply its evils if they are given funds to expand rather than being left to wither and die? In a letter, one response was well put by Charles Morgan, Director of the Southern Regional Office of the American Civil Liberties Union:

> I believe it next to impossible to upgrade Negro institutions of higher learning so that they will become competitive with white institutions.

> In short, I believe Brown v. Board was right in its factual assumption that separate means unequal, and I believe this is inherent. A white community will not support Negro institutions which are racially segregated, the continuation of such institutions perpetuates unqualified teaching in the public school system, and the past years should, I think, have showed us the necessity for immediate desegregation at whatever the cost.

A summer's experience and reflection leads me to strongly disagree with Mr. Morgan. I have increasingly come to agree with Dr. McGrath that failure to recognize the present need for predominantly Negro colleges would represent a very grave error on the civil rights front. In any event, full support for the predominantly Negro colleges is at least justified over the next decade as a transitional measure. Certainly not all such institutions merit full or perhaps any support, but the best of them clearly do. Beyond that, the development of courses of possible use at many Negro colleges and a widespread availability of National Teaching Fellows, particularly as replacement personnel for permanent faculty away on graduate study, could do something for almost all of the predominantly Negro colleges.

Aside from the fact that they are the institutions that serve approximately sixty percent of all Negro college students, the Negro colleges have much to be said for them. Most particularly in light of the inferior educational backgrounds with which so many of their students come to college, they can be seen as having the quality of "institutional patience"--something lacking in American higher education today, and yet very vital for the academic survival of large numbers of Negro high school graduates going on to college. Benjamin Mayes, President of Morehouse College, has spoken feelingly and effectively of the role of those schools in working with and developing bright young Negro leaders who would otherwise not have received an education or who would too often have been placed on specially lowered standards in order to get through other colleges. In addition, the Negro colleges have supplied and will continue to supply a major segment of the Negro community leadership. Even beyond that, Howard Zinn has suggested that the Negro colleges have a unique role to play entirely apart from the clearly vital one of turning out tens of thousands of first-rate college graduates:

> There is too much wistful talk in education circles about how far Negro colleges must go to "catch up" with the rest. What is overlooked is that the Negro colleges have one supreme advantage over the others: they are the nearest this country has to a racial microcosm of the world outside the United States, a world largely non-white, developing, and filled with the tensions of bourgeois emulation and radical protest. And with more white students and foreign students entering, Negro universities might become our first massively integrated, truly international educational centers.
>
> Surely, it is a prime function of the university to expand the consciousness of the student beyond the world he knows. And it becomes increasingly evident that, in the second half of this century, our nation is having difficulty understanding and dealing with the explosive world of Africans, Asians, Latins. If the United States is a white, affluent, middle-aged stranger in a dark-skinned, poverty-stricken, revolutionary world, then a predominantly Negro university

> which attracts students from all countries can become uniquely effective as an educational center for young Americans.

To put the predominantly Negro colleges on a par with denominational schools as competitors for support under the Title III program is again to favor the notion of giving little bits to all rather than having the courage to choose hard priorities.

To be sure, 61 percent of the $5 million in Title III funds this past year were given for programs at predominantly Negro colleges. Yet, the Title III office insists that that was only because the Negro colleges have had greater experience and sophistication in working out cooperative programs. Presumably, as other small schools link up with larger institutions, they will receive an increasing proportion of Title III funds.

To protest this is not to call for "reverse discrimination," nor to call for programs making Negroes special wards of the federal government. The simple fact is that it is objective standards which earn for the Negro colleges substantially higher priorities than other classes of small colleges. Three criteria immediately suggest themselves as priorities under which a well thought-out Title III program should operate. First is the factor of geography. The Title III guidelines should suggest that the absence of a cluster of other institutions available to the student population of an applicant school should be a factor meriting a higher Title III priority. To be sure, such a priority would tend to favor Negro schools in the South, but surely it is reasonable to expect that the schools which should most be supported are the ones whose non-existence would most deprive their student populations of college educations. A second factor relates to the quality of the student population. The Title III guidelines should suggest that the extent to which an applicant institution must "make up the difference" in providing education for its students will serve to raise its priority rating for Title III assistance. Again, a predominantly Negro college in Mississippi which takes in students from a school system in which only eight percent of the high schools are accredited and only two of 187 offer Latin, 12 offer geometry and fewer than half offer any course in physics, should receive substantial support. Having a greater role to play as an educational institution, it ought to merit greater support than a school whose student population is presumably more capable of getting an education "on its own." Closely related to that notion is one suggested by the Office of Education's own "Equality of Educational Opportunity" report. Pointed out by Commissioner Howe as its "most revealing" aspec was the finding of the report that the average achievement of students from good homes and economic backgrounds was less affected by the quality of their schools than was the achievement of those students coming from low socio-economic backgrounds:

> The schools do differ, however, in the degree of impact they have on the various racial and ethnic groups. The average white student's achievement is less affected by the strength or weakness of his schools's facilities, curricula, and teachers than is the average minority pupil's. To put it another way, the achievement of minority pupils depends more on the schools they attend than does the achievement of majority pupils.

> Thus 20 percent of the achievement of Negroes in the South is associated with the particular schools they go to, whereas only 10 percent of the achievement of whites in the South is. Except for Oriental Americans, this general result is found for all minorities.

In the light of the limited amount of funds for Title III, the marginal utility principle dictates a higher Title III priority to predominantly Negro colleges because of the quality of their student populations. If a dollar spent in raising the quality of a Negro college will have twice the impact of a dollar spent on a small, Midwestern denominational college, it is reasonable to assume that the Negro college merits a higher priority. This is so not because Negroes should receive beneficent quotas, but because the government as a dispenser of funds must maximize the impact of what it does. To say that is not to suggest that Title III funds ought to be limited to predominantly Negro colleges. Far from it. Yet at the same time the failure to recognize factors which would have the effect of placing the predominantly Negro colleges in a greater priority position for Title III funds is clearly mistaken.

VI INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION AND THE FUTURE

PERSPECTIVES ON CHANGE

Change in higher education hinges on how seriously institutions respond to the great challenge of integration. Certainly much more attention must be paid to the needs of Negro students who have been traditionally outside the mainstream of education. Recognition that the Negro is needed in higher education must come before we achieve the "Great Society" goal of an integrated America.

The university, according to Doctor Howard, is a logical seed bed of integration; an institution with a genuine sense of social responsibility could create, in miniature, an integrated society that the country at large could imitate. In such a venture, "the university would have the task of showing America how joyful and productive integrated living can and must be."

Some ways in which the integrated colleges of the North could perform more effectively have been advanced by Doxey A. Wilkerson and Edmund W. Gordon. The special problems common to Negro students must be acknowledged by these institutions: "Although many institutions have modified their financial aid policies to help disadvantaged Negro students enter college, it appears that very few of them have modified such policies to help these students succeed once they are enrolled."

Michael J. Horowitz explained that circumstances combine to give Negro colleges priority in the competition for Title III funds. It is not a question of "reverse discrimination," but simple economics for Title III administrators to allocate funds to those schools which promise the biggest returns for the money.

Approaching change in education from a different perspective, Charles W. Slack maintained that the new educational technology is highly applicable to interinstitutional situations. He also noted that increased working arrangements between higher education and industry could be profitable for both.

Some possibilities for this exchange with business and industry, as well as difficulties in financing innovative programs and the political implications of Title III, were discussed at the conference. Would the benefits that industrial cooperation brought be negated by "big business" tactics? Would congressional attempts to snare Title III funds for constituents spread the available money too thinly? Some of this dialogue between conference participants is presented here:

PERSPECTIVES ON THE APPLICATION OF BUSINESS METHODS:

Business Offers Resources

> The big business corporation could provide technical resources for the small college. Within companies like General Electric, RCA, or IBM are qualified people in every realm of the arts and sciences. They are dying to teach part time but can't afford to leave their jobs . . . For example, an intriguing

course in computer use has been developed in the Westinghouse training department by an assistant engineer who wants to teach. He has given the course five times and wants to continue, hoping to produce a college level, undergraduate course. A package course like this could be taught in a small developing college. But there is no outlet. A group of young, brilliant systems people are knocking on college doors and being turned down.

Colleges Resist Outside Help

Another example is a method of classroom management at the elementary levels, designed for use in self-instructional materials. The educational technologists who have contracted to teach the system to teachers are meeting resistance from professional educators, who are not about to admit that a bunch of technicians from Westinghouse or GE can come in and give a course for credit. But perhaps an underdeveloped college, properly backed by the Office of Education, could say, "What have we got to lose?"

Drawbacks Exposed

The equivalent to the classroom and automation is the kitchen and its automation. (I think the classroom is about 50 years behind the kitchen.) In the early days, there was tremendous labor involved; the housewife believed there had to be blood on the toast each morning to prove that her heart was in the kitchen. The hybrid of the engineer and the housewife carried the kitchen into the twentieth century, but there have been ups and downs. The two have exploited each other at various times. It's questionable, in the long run, whether you can cook better food in a modern kitchen than you could in Grandma's kitchen.

Business Methods Questioned

What will probably happen regarding programmed instruction and the teaching machines is that corporations will invest huge sums of money to develop these big packages. Once they begin developing, they're going to try to sell them, which means they'll have a line to the PTA, to the theses being written, and to the professional meetings. Everybody will be wined and dined. The question will be: are you going to sign with GE or with Westinghouse? There will be hysteria about buying the new systems. We may end up having more efficient learning of things that themselves have little meaning.

Should Technology Be Split?

We are constantly reminded how poorly prepared and trained incoming students are. We might be able to make twice the gain in basic skills by using the automated devices that educational companies have. Perhaps it would make sense to divide the technical functions between the schools and industry?

Developing Would Be Downgraded

If these functions were divided, the lower level of technology would get pushed into the developing institutions. Technology should be used all along the way, not just in basic skills. Otherwise developing schools turn into technical or vocational schools.

Funds Scarce for Innovation

Funds are generally available for the conventional. A Toynbee, for example, commands resources because he's a man of prestige although he might not be good for students. In contrast, someone who is "off beat" may really communicate with students. The problem is, how does one get money to try new ideas?

Research Meets Resistance

I can give you examples from my own research with delinquent kids. The spark behind the research was the fact that we paid these kids money. This was considered unprofessional, and we came under attack. But eventually our data was used in planning the Job Corps. Now everybody's paying kids, although there is still some resistance to the idea. After a certain point when we had published and a film studio was planning a movie about us, the foundations were for it . . . We did crazy things with that money, capricious things. There was no planning, and you could never justify this to the federal government. We didn't even try. One of the principles we wrote up is that if you want to give a gift to a welfare-street kid, it has to be the very finest of whatever it is. You couldn't get these kinds of things from a donor to support the very heart of the project. They say, "Oh, we are very interested in your work, but don't do these unusual things."

Financial Problem Tackled

In attacking this financial problem, the first step is to get into simple operations research. The grant makers are really prescribing before they fully diagnose. First, let's diagnose; let's look at the whole hard facts of these institutions.

Development Proves Costly

Next, the government must understand development costs. There's a lack of appreciation of what research-and-development really is, as opposed to research-and-evaluation. Too few understand the difference between developmental costs and the cost of the final product. It might cost a million dollars to develop a cup that eventually costs a mill to make. Similarly, in teaching middle class English to lower class undergraduates, we can evolve a system which will cost less than existing systems. It may be automated, use the computer, or call for peer tutors. The cost of developing that system may be great, but once it's developed, it can be applied throughout.

New Systems Stir Opposition

The use of new systems always involves undercutting someone's idea of his profession. The linguist is not going to like the idea of peer tutors. The English teacher will resist the intrusion by anthropology. Because federal funding procedures involve interdisciplinary committees, each member with his own disciplinary ax to grind, many innovations are not carried through. So these new systems spring out of the private sector, out of the mass movements. The civil rights movement, for example, was not a professional sociological development. At first, it was resisted by the professional sociologists. To speed up the development process and produce efficient systems for change, the government must reinforce these maverick imbalances when they show up.

Colleges Duplicate Efforts

The lowest breaking point for full time enrollment has been set at 1,200 to 1,500 students. About 80 percent of the 123 predominately Negro colleges are much too small, with fewer than 1,000 students. Duplication is responsible for much of this problem. For example, Atlanta alone has several of these schools--Morehouse, Clarke, Spelman, Morris Brown, and Atlanta University. Together they could have between 5,000 and 6,000 students, but they might as well be 1,000 miles apart. Shaw in Raleigh, N.C., is practically across the street from St. Augustine's, but it's a big, wide street! One danger in Title III is a charity approach that perpetuates separateness.

Mergers Are Opposed

Work in the area of mergers, consolidation, and consortia is difficult for a variety of reasons. For one thing, there are three kinds of Negro colleges: Those established by white churches as home missionary efforts; those established by predominately Negro denominations in the South, and the state institutions which were really a response to the separate but equal decisions of the court seven or eight years ago. These schools are jealous of their prerogatives and have been on the charity syndrome for so long it is hard for them to face some of the facts of life.

PERSPECTIVES ON POLITICAL FACTORS AFFECTING TITLE III:

Congress Decides Fate

Title III is caught in political matters. It is the only title in the Higher Education Act which has to be reviewed by Congress. It remains for Congress to decide whether Title III will continue. This means automatically that Title III people are under pressure, and could be one of the best reasons for making sure that a lot of people get at least a little.

Is Distribution Too Wide?

Legislators are pressed to see that a certain amount of the benefits come to their congressional districts. To some extent, this tendency might tie the hands of the people in the developing offices. Is there not an inherent drive to distribute the funds widely among institutions? I've been told that the intent of the title was primarily to serve the Negro colleges, yet there's been tremendous inroads by other kinds of schools. Great difficulties are inevitable in taking a sum of money which might do a big job within a limited number of institutions and frittering it away on a large number of proposals.

Ambivalence Is Noted

It may be a mis-assessment for administrators to think they can save the boat by giving a little and giving it quickly. The big money, some sixty percent, has gone to the Negro colleges. But again, there is a curious ambivalence. The Office tends to insist that the only reason more money went to the Negro colleges is because they had more experience with these cooperative programs and presumably more expertise in working up good proposals. Yet, I understand that what they gave had very little relation to what was requested.

Title III Is Vital

As a political matter, Congress seems to view Title III as the chief instrument for assisting Negro colleges. Perhaps Title III has to be made an all-purpose instrument for aiding these colleges because Congress is not likely to give any other major assistance . . . The stakes are terribly high, because if Title III does not succeed, these developing colleges are not likely to receive much federal help from any other title or agency.

Emphasize Statewide Planning

The relationship of universities, both public and private, with state governments is going to increase. We must take into account the growing role of the statewide coordinating boards. In state after state, these boards are doing master planning and involving the private sector in these master plans. This creates preconditions for a whole set of exchanges within the public family and between public and private institutions.

Institutional Role Stressed

This is apparent also in the "urge to merge," where you begin to develop, not a lot of separate institutions, but an overall university as in California. There should be more emphasis on what Crawford Clark has called the "institutional role," the set of relationships which serve as a buffer between the school and the outside forces so that limits can be set with respect to resources used within the system.

Look Beyond Local Campus

> In terms of systems theory, you can't merely look to the local campus. You have to consider the coordinating board, the governor, and the legislature. In terms of interinstitutional cooperation, this may be good or bad, but my hunch is that it will stimulate intrastate cooperation. At any rate, you see just part of the picture if you keep your eyes glued on the individual campus and ignore the whole coordinating system.

The foregoing discussion indicates that certain educational changes can be engineered with new methods developed by industry. Business methods can also be helpful in cutting costs and in raising funds to develop new programs. Even more exciting possibilities for cooperation between business and higher education should be explored. One conference participant went so far as to suggest that a big corporation buy a small college and institute good management procedures. It is doubtful whether such a step will be taken, but the alignment between business and higher education should certainly be encouraged.

The allocation of Title III funds hinges, to some extent, on political factors. There is the danger that zealous congressmen will claim available funds for their constituents, at the expense of more deserving institutions in other areas. Another mistake would be to scatter small amounts too widely, rather than concentrating larger sums on really significant projects. The increasingly active role of statewide planning boards is another political factor calling for careful observation. It was predicted during the discussion that stronger public boards in the South would discourage the public Negro colleges from one-to-one interinstitutional exchanges.

All of these political and economic implications have relevance for interinstitutional cooperation. Business techniques, which have been tested in the complex world of industry, should adapt easily to the simpler relationships between institutions. Without political support and the resulting financial security, the future of interinstitutional cooperation itself is in doubt.

LOOKING AHEAD IN INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

What lies ahead in interinstitutional cooperation? Shaping this future was the aim of the Wingspread conference, where distinguished educators, social critics, and government representatives discussed the hopes and hurdles encountered in cooperative ventures between established and developing institutions.

Yet, the concept of interinstitutional cooperation stretches far beyond the proposed exchanges between advanced and developing schools. For example, Morris Keeton considers the cooperative idea one of the facts of life in the liberal arts college of the future. In the next decades, campus boundaries will become "permeable membranes," permitting a dual flow of educational resources between institutions.

Greater interdependence between institutions becomes vital as students demand new skills and broader perspectives to face the increasingly complex world of the future. The individual college, unable to meet all these demands on its own, can draw on the resources of other colleges and universities through an educational network. Students at each school can tap these resources, while enjoying close associations with faculty members in the more intimate atmospheres of their own campuses. Doctor Keeton does not agree that this trend toward interconnectedness poses a threat to liberal education; rather, it can serve the liberal arts aim of "freeing the individual from the normal limitations of his own local and cultural particularity."

Projections into the future of higher education are offered by Robert J. Havighurst, who reinforces his predictions with statistical tables. By 1970, institutions of higher education in this country will be classed in three probable categories: the community and junior colleges offering two-year programs; the four and five-year institutions that will award 90 percent of the bachelors degrees and a majority of the masters degrees, and the major universities and research centers that emphasize doctoral study and research.

The general functions of education will be shaped to conform to these colleges of the near future. Since the 1950's, the production function has dominated, as colleges and universities turn out graduates for productive work in an affluent society. The opportunity function has also been significant--higher education is the chief source of upward social mobility for students from low socio-economic backgrounds.

Both of these functions will remain important in the higher education of the future. But, as the post-war baby boom feeds more young adults into the economy, the emphasis on production will probably decline. Unlike his older brother of the 50's, whose degree was a magic key into an expanding labor market, the college graduate of the 70's may face a shortage of job opportunities. It is hoped that a growing economy will create new jobs for the available manpower; but the production function of higher education will probably assume less significance. The opportunity function will be discharged chiefly by the two, four and five-year institutions, with the possibility of state-financed education for students between the ages of three and twenty.

In the years ahead, the consumption function will become more important. In a society marked by increased leisure and affluence, education will be regarded as a good in itself rather than a means to economic progress. Already this trend is evident in the growth of adult education programs which stress learning for itself instead of any productive value.

Interinstitutional cooperation will be another major factor in the higher education of the future, especially for the four and five-year colleges which require quality offerings that the individual colleges could not provide alone. Cooperation promises special reinforcement for the consumption function, enabling colleges to share cultural resources and activities. Institutions in a specific area can also unite to upgrade the cultural resources of their area or to stimulate community development

Theodore J. Marchese, Jr. notes that the great increase in interinstitutional cooperation reflects the changing nature of higher education and its relationship with society. However, he makes clear, interinstitutional cooperation is only one tool in the development of institutions. Often another device may be more effective, and still more often, a combination of tools will be best.

Five principles are proposed for interinstitutional cooperation: the necessity for energic feedback to the assisting institution; the need for affinity of interests between cooperating institutions; the realization that colleges in other regions must assist the often isolated southern schools; the recognition by the developing schools of the need for change, and their consequent willingness to accept help in achieving this change.

In implementing Title III, it is recommended that the federal government make larger commitments over a longer time span. The necessary legislative tools must also be provided, along with the administrative flexibility for employing a variety of these tools in programs of cooperation.

The need for better planning was a recurrent theme at the conference. Long range planning and institutional self-studies were advanced by several participants as a precondition to the awarding of Title III grants. Conference participants also outlined the criteria to be considered in selecting the developing institutions for Title III programs.

STRUGGLE AND PROMISE--A FUTURE FOR LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES

Morris Keeton
Academic Vice President
Antioch College

The typical private liberal arts college of the mid-twentieth century is obsolete. Its sovereign isolation, its protected students, the one-track careers of its faculty, and its tepid purposes mark it as unsuited to the needs of the decades ahead.

Survival for its own sake is a purpose unworthy of America's liberal arts colleges. They are but instruments of liberal education; it was never more needed than today in our society, but it can be provided in many ways. Unless liberal education can be better achieved with the help of these colleges than without, it is time for their demise.

What the future of liberal arts colleges should be is thus not a question of survival, but one of their function and significance in the world that is about to be. Survival without legitimate function is entirely possible in affluent America. At the very time when Jacques Barzun voices fear that the traditional function of the colleges is being sapped away, they prosper. New colleges--public and private, free standing and embedded in complex universities--are created each year. Many others are achieving their first accreditation. Formerly struggling colleges now thrive. Some that were on the verge of financial ruin begin to bulge with students and to shine with the glass and steel of new buildings. In the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, initially composed almost entirely of unaccredited colleges, the last decade has brought steady and substantial increase in numbers and ability of students, in number of faculty and percentage of doctorates among them, in salaries, endowment, buildings, and expenditures per student. These achievements have not come easily. Some colleges face setbacks today and a harder time tomorrow. But for the majority of colleges today, "struggle" means, not the worried attempt to fill beds and meet a minimum payroll, but rather the hard work of reshaping or re-discovering their central purpose, getting the students and faculty for it, and evoking from them teaching and learning proper to that purpose. There is no doubt that the liberal arts college, as a visible set of facilities and activities, is surviving.

Our question, however, is whether it should survive. Is liberal education what the current numbers of students really seek or need? Are private colleges prospering only because more efficient and equally effective public institutions cannot yet assimilate the full load? Precisely what is surviving at these colleges--a fun culture? prevocational workshops? an outlet for adolescent unrest and discontent with contemporary society? or a competent probing in idea and act into the nature and possibilities of men and society? To thoughtful minds in some of the most secure colleges these questions do not seem easy. Their struggle for strength seems sometimes to call for changes that go to the root of the colleges' life.

We believe, to repeat, that the familiar free-standing four-year liberal arts college of the mid-twentieth century is already obsolete. Emerging within its precincts is a new set of institutions. In these emerging institutions there should be--we do not know whether there will be--an increasing commitment to liberal education. There should also be--we do not know whether there will be--more room for private initiative and diverse control patterns. Diversity of purpose and philosophy there will surely be. On this score, at least, "will be" coincides with "ought to be."

The good college a decade hence should be distinguished in five ways from its typical counterpart of the recent past:

by its intricate and active engagement in a network of educational opportunities beyond its old campus boundaries;

by the large responsibilities its students will carry in the tasks of education, administration, research, and public service;

by the colorful and diverse careers of its faculty;

by the individualization, the sophistication, and the rich rewards of its life of learning; and

by the complexity of purposes that will enliven its learning and teaching.

The example of emerging networks will show something of the need for these developments. Why, first of all, the need for greater interdependence of colleges and other institutions of our society? The world of the 1970's and later is to be one of greatly increased numbers of people, a rising rate of change, greater human mobility, a more complex social order within and among national cultures, a growing diversity of vocations of which an increasing proportion will require collegiate education, lives of greater leisure, and more frequent changes of work and residence. If a person is to realize his fullest potentialities, these conditions will put a premium upon his ability to appreciate a much wider range of experience than before, to adjust to more varied contexts and to shape them, to re-open and re-consider opinions once settled, to re-evaluate commitments once appropriate, and to act as these reflections guide him in re-ordering his life. But these are precisely the concerns at the core of liberal education.

The array of faculty talent that was once sufficient for undergraduate education no longer is. The colleges that try to make do as self-sufficient teaching communities are either feeling the inadequacy of their staffs or deceiving themselves. They arrange exchanges to increase their access to diverse competencies, provide for temporary student sojourns elsewhere, enrich their troupe of visiting scholars, or pipe the specialists' voice and face in by telelecture and television. In short, eagerly or reluctantly, the campus has made its boundaries into permeable membranes. Directly or indirectly, it taps the resources of a wider array of institutions--governmental, educational, commercial, and industrial.

Perhaps, it is argued, this is a development to be resisted, an erosion of the core function of liberal education and a withering of the colleges preliminary to their complete demise. Thus a Wesleyan University committee has argued that the colleges must become small university-like institutions or perish. The transformation into a small university is indeed one way that a college can meet some of the emerging needs, but it is neither the only viable response nor one that will arrest the increase of interdependence.

Another response to this pressure is the formation of associations, confederations, contracts for special services by other agencies, neighborly barter, and other consortial arrangements. The effect of these associative arrangements is to form a network of educational services which the student may tap from his own college. The college continues to be his educational home. Here he is, or should be, well known to one or more faculty, for whom his education whole is the primary concern and the principal vocational mission. They give, or obtain access to, whatever diagnostic, teaching, and evaluative services he needs. If this language is analogous to that in clinical medicine, it is not meant to suggest a therapeutic institution. A college necessarily so functions at times; but if its appropriate character is not to be compromised, it must never become a predominantly therapeutic endeavor. It is primarily an intellectual community, a teaching and learning community. The concept of an educational network offers both an efficient and an effective response to the demands for the competent and individualized educational services needed in the upcoming decades. The network idea, however, is no cure-all. The colleges pioneering its use have found many boobytraps and blind alleys in trying to implement it. It permits a college to remain a more intimate community than does the "small university" solution. Use of a network can avoid some of the cost of providing a very complex and extensive range of educational opportunity at the home site.

Some colleges are combining the network idea with a half-step toward becoming a university. For example, a few M.A.T. or M.A. programs in large departments or in interdisciplinary programs may be efficient without vastly enlarging and depersonalizing the campus. In general, however, the term "small college" no longer means what it once did. The average institution of higher education today has about 1800 students. The popular idea that universities can divide into sub-colleges to gain the same combination of advantages of the small and the large is only partially correct. It corresponds to the mistake made by many small colleges that fail to gain quality by getting larger. Size as such is no guarantee of benefit. Size can be made to serve a distinctive mission and a concern for excellence of staff and program, but without these a college can flap crazily in the gales of growth.

A further variation on this theme of creating an educational network is the choice to specialize in third to fifth year programs of higher education. This option holds down the increase in total size and retains the interest of most scholarly faculty. This option also permits a wide array of specialists, but may involve a high cost per student. It may mean a surrender of that part of the mission of liberal education which counterbalances the pressures for overspecialization and narrowness in discipline. To rebut this last point by placing the responsibility for liberal education in the first two years of college is to embrace a misconception, for liberal education is not a task that may legitimately be cut off at a certain age or grade level, or left thereafter to chance. A third to fifth year program should have its own way of continuing liberal education--at a more advanced level than in the opening years of college, and surely not as an isolated program of courses, but as an explicit and high priority mission of professional education. Otherwise, this "solution" is indeed a case of the demise of a liberal arts college.

Another way of providing diverse opportunities in a college career is one contrived by students and tolerated by colleges or, in some cases, arranged by colleges under their own aegis. This is the system of granting leaves of absence in which students travel, work, or study abroad, recuperate from the pressures of campus, get their bearings on personal goals and life's meaning, or otherwise gain and digest experience of "the world outside." This arrangement differs from the official "network" in the sense that the experience away from campus is not supervised by the college faculty or student personnel staff. Hence it is not likely to yield as great educational results as a well-managed network arrangement would, though there are both poorly managed networks and well-conducted leaves, so that the choice is not simple. For a student in financial distress, the leave preserves his later access to the college and eliminates all but a nominal cost of preserving that access. The widespread pattern of dropping out of one college and later transferring to another often provides enrichment and escape from the provincialism of the single small-and-isolated or big-and-impersonal campus. When not consciously managed to serve the aims of liberal education it is, of course, less likely to serve them well; but colleges may not rest comfortably on that assurance. Students sometimes do better unwittingly--or quite consciously--than the single campus establishment permits.

Some of the most devoted champions of liberal education view these trends as a potentially fatal threat to liberal education. We nevertheless believe that the trend toward interconnectedness may not only be reconciled with the objectives of liberal education but may even be employed to further its aim of freeing the individual from the normal limitations of his local and cultural particularity. It can indeed assist him to discover his own greatest potential (and in this sense his "identity") and the distinctive values of his own locale and cultural origins. But the idea of an educational network creates great difficulties for a college: the number of possible links within the network is enormous. A poor choice can create waste and frustration. Each associative tie will require some managing, and poor management can render even promising associations futile. This management can also prove costly. Finally, the college's character and clientele will be determined partly by the links chosen and those rejected. Each college that chooses to create such an educational network will need to reflect on alternative possibilities and on the ways to make reasonable choices among them.

Copyrighted by author, 1967.

THE SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Robert J. Havighurst
Professor of Education and Human Development
The University of Chicago

Any serious consideration of policy in higher education should look ahead to the period from 1970 to 1980. The immediate present is so full of change and emergency measures that one cannot project the future on the base of the present, or usefully formulate policy that is closely tied to the immediate facts of enrollment, demand for college graduates, and pressure for entrance to higher institutions.

It is important to keep in mind the fact that college enrollments in the period from 1950 to 1970 reflect fifteen years of low birth rates due to the Depression 30's and the wartime uncertainties of 1940-46, combined with a sharp rise in birth rates between 1946 and 1950 which is flooding the colleges in 1965-70.

The boom in college enrollments that took place in the 1950-65 period rested on a nearly stable college-age population, and showed how the manpower needs of a booming economy combined with the attractive ideal of upward economic mobility through a college education could double the proportion of the age group graduating from college.

Table 1 shows these figures, together with data on the proportions of an age group entering college. It is not at all clear what will happen to these proportions during the next few years, as the pressure grows on the colleges to accommodate more students. In this writer's judgment, the proportions of an age group entering a post-secondary institution will level off at around 40 percent; and the proportion completing a four-year college program or a first professional degree will level off at about 20 percent, if, indeed, they go above the present 18 percent.

The job market for college graduates and for young adults in general will certainly be affected by a jump in the number of 22-year-olds from about 3 million in 1968 to 3.7 million in 1969 (a 23 percent increase).

The new level will then stabilize for the following ten years at between 3.6 and 4.0 million 22-year-olds, and the labor market for young adults will adjust to this level.

College enrollments in the 1970's will be related in a complex way to labor market conditions. It will not be as simple as it was in the 1950's when the expanding labor market cried for more college graduates out of unusually small annual cohorts. Some young people will go to college in order to be in a better position to compete for jobs, while others will decide not to go to college because the competition is too severe for them. And some will go to college without regard to the advantage this gives them in the labor market. Probably an increasing number will go to college for non-economic reasons; but we do not have any basis for estimating the size of this group.

In general, this observer expects a stabilized college enrollment for 1970-80 at the levels already indicated.

By 1970, every state will have a rational plan for support of higher education, and this plan will be operating. Generally, the state plans will make liberal provisions for the support of colleges, junior colleges, and state universities.

By 1970, we may expect the principles of federal government support of higher education to be established. By that date, there will have been time to study the effects of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and the major categories of federal government aid will be stabilized. The nature of student assistance will be established, and states will have their state scholarship programs in working order.

CATEGORIES OF INSTITUTIONS

Probably a set of categories like the following will describe the higher institutions of the country by 1970.

I. Community Colleges and Junior Colleges

These will be institutions with two-year programs. They will carry an increasing proportion of the load of college instruction for the first two years of college work. This group numbers about 700, and will contain about 20 percent of the college enrollment of the country.

II. Four and Five-Year Colleges and Universities

The greatest number of institutions will fall in this middle category. They will all give a four-year degree and many of them will give a masters degree. Some will be public--municipal colleges and members of state systems of colleges and universities. The majority will be private--independent or church-related.

This category may be conveniently divided into two sub-groups.

IIA Those with greater financial resources, reputations as high-class liberal arts colleges, and highly selective in their student body. This group numbers about 200.

IIB Those with lesser financial resources, with average or below-average status among the colleges of the country. This group numbers about 1,100.

Some of the largest institutions in the country will be included in this category II, as well as some of the smallest. They will award 90 percent of the bachelor's degrees, and the majority of the master's degrees. Though they will be ambitious to have their faculties do research, and some of them will have small doctoral training programs, these will be primarily teaching institutions.

III. Major Universities and Research Institutes

A relatively small number of universities will carry the major load of training at the Ph.D. level, of research, and of training the elite of the professions. These universities are now in theprocess of becoming complexes of research institutes, with the undergraduate teaching function definitely subordinated to the research and research training function. They will have restricted their intake of undergraduate students in numbers and in academic aptitude to young people who have a high probability of going on to graduate work.

The prototypes are Columbia, Harvard, Chicago, Stanford, University of California at Berkeley, University of Michigan, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Perhaps 30 or 40 institutions will qualify for this list by 1970. An equal number will be working in that direction, and hoping to attain it by 1980.

This type of institution will turn out annually between 50,000 and 80,000 bachelors of arts, no more than ten percent of the total numbers produced in the country.

GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION

Table 2 shows the distribution of undergraduate students by size of the metropolitan area in which the institution is located. This table indicates that college enrollments are distributed in fairly close relation to population of metropolitan areas. This is somewhat unexpected. A large number of state universities are located in relatively small cities, and a large number of liberal arts colleges are located in communities of less than 50,000 which means that they are generally in non-metropolitan areas. But recent developments in the state systems of higher education have tended to locate new and growing institutions in the population centers.

Probably this means that the proportions of college students who live at home and "commute" to college is increasing. It also probably means that the number of institutions is increasing which serve primarily a commuting clientele.

The institutions of type II are distributed among the various sizes of metropolitan areas roughly as the population is, with a slight tendency to cluster in non-metropolitan areas, as is seen in Table 2. These colleges will contain the majority of students who reside away from home, in contrast to type I.

FUNCTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, 1970-80

There are three broad functions of higher education in a democratic commercial-industrial society--production, opportunity and consumption functions. The production function has dominated, since 1950, combined with the opportunity function. Probably the consumption function will become more important in the 1970-80 decade.

The Production Function

During recent decades, the colleges and universities of the United States have been mainly concerned with training people to be productive workers in a highly productive and efficient economy. We have become aware of the value to society of investing in human capital--that is, of educating people to become productive agents in an affluent society. We have also had to train scholars to staff the faculties of expanding colleges.

The major universities have been devoted almost entirely to the production function. They have trained the people who have created and maintained the economic machinery of the society. They have done much of the research that led to greater economic productivity. They have also trained the leaders of business, law, medicine, and the church.

The United States government has put billions of dollars into support of the production function in the leading universities of the country, through grants from the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, and through scholarships and training grants to young scholars.

If there was no other function of higher education, the major universities could go on indefinitely much as they are now. Their activities during the 1970-80 period will probably continue much the same.

The institutions of category II have also been important in serving the production function in the 1950-65 period. They have trained most of the school teachers of the country. They have produced the majority of people who have gone on to take graduate degrees to serve productive functions in the society.

The community colleges and junior colleges have served the production function in a limited way by training technicians, and also by giving the first two years of a liberal arts education to students who went on for a college degree.

If the supply of college students increases by 1970 to the point where it exceeds the demand of the labor market for productive workers, then this production function will have to be supplemented by other functions, or the college enrollments will decrease.

The Opportunity Function

Higher education has become the major source of upward social mobility, which has great social value in the United States. The opportunity function is discharged by giving youth of low family income an opportunity to get a good education and thereby to rise in the social status system.

In the coming decade, the opportunity function will probably be discharged mainly by institutions of categories I and II. The major universities are not directly concerned with creating socio-economic opportunity for individuals. Such a university does not care whom it educates, as long as it gets students who will become efficient producers. It will become as selective as possible of students who promise productive efficiency, and will provide opportunity to poor but able youth only as these happen to meet its requirements.

There is much talk today of providing education, at state expense, if necessary, to everyone from age three to age twenty. This would be done for opportunity reasons. If there is a major effort to keep all students in school beyond age sixteen, and to send more of them to college, the colleges of categories I and II will carry the responsibility of providing the educational opportunity.

The Consumption Function

Education as a consumption good is something people want to enjoy, rather than to use as a means of greater economic production. They may want higher education because it helps them enjoy literature, music, art, theater. They may want higher education because it makes them better parents or better church members, better citizens. They may want higher education for their daughters because it will help them to get acquainted with and to marry successful men.

In an affluent and highly productive society, with more leisure for most people and more money to use on leisure activities, education as a consumption good is sure to gain in value in the eyes of the people.

Although we are not well prepared by experience or by tradition to use higher education as a consumption good, our society is being pushed in that direction by the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities, by some of the private educational foundation, and by the movement for greater cultural value in television. We have a growing adult education movement, in which most of the new growth has a consumption rather than a production function.

As college enrollments grow beyond what is needed for the production function, we shall hear more from college educators about the consumption function. This will be done largely by colleges in category II.

Will College Enrollments Expand Beyond the Needs of the Production Function?

The preceding discussion has indicated that college enrollments can only serve the production function up to a certain point, when further college-educated people will not increase production much more. We are near that point now, and will probably pass it around 1970. In his book, American Higher Education in the 1960's, Havighurst estimated the present and future demand of the labor market for college graduates. He found that the development of technology is increasing the proportion of jobs in the labor force which are thought by employers to require college-level training. At present some 22 percent of the jobs filled by men in the labor force are considered by employers and by the American public generally to require a college degree. And approximately 22 percent of young men are currently graduating from college. The number of young women graduating from college is about 14 percent, making 18 percent of the two sexes combined, as is seen in Table I.

It follows from this line of reasoning that any further increase in the college graduation rate for men will create a situation in which there may be more applicants than jobs in a few years, when the present backlog of unfilled jobs is consumed. And the sharp increase in the numbers of new young adults after 1969 may produce unemployment among college graduates.

The proponents of college expansion argue that the technology is changing so rapidly that the proportion of jobs requiring college training will increase enough to create a demand for the increased numbers of college graduates. The writer's conservative estimates of increase in college graduation rate in Table 3 sees the proportion of young men graduating from college in 1970 as 27 percent, plus 18 percent of young women, or an average of 23 percent of the age group. If this figure is reached, or exceeded as is prophesied by most students of higher education, the new college graduate will be in a much less favorable position for job-seeking then he is today.

In this connection it is interesting to note in Table 1 that the proportion of an age group graduating from college has been rather stable between 17 and 18 percent since 1960, while the proportion entering college has increased from 31 to 37 percent. Thus it appears that we are "selling" the idea of college-going more effectively than we are realizing the idea of college-graduation.

This may also indicate that the consumption function of college education is increasing in importance, compared with the production and opportunity functions. That is, the increasing numbers of college entrants who do not graduate may profit from greater emphasis on consumption values in college.

COOPERATION OF HIGHER INSTITUTIONS

The cooperative movement among higher institutions has grown quietly but rapidly. It is one of the beneficiaries of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Though Title III of that Act was not widely heralded at the time, it seems to have come just when it could do the most good.

Though some degree of cooperation is achieved through organizations of colleges and universities on a national or a regional scale, the most effective kinds have appeared recently with the development of small groups of institutions which had something in common and could easily cooperate to serve their common good.

There is a natural form of cooperation for universities of category III. They cooperate in certain major research programs financed by the federal government, such as laboratories for nuclear research and space science programs. They will probably cooperate in programs of collection and retrieval of scientific knowledge. They may also cooperate in national organizations which are concerned with federal government policy in the area of scientific research and higher education. Also, two or more universities which are located close together sometimes find it advantageous to work together on a problem related to their location, such as the Joint Center for Urban Studies maintained by Harvard and Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Cooperation is not especially useful for community colleges of category I. They have a relatively clear mission--to prepare technicians, to give the first two years of a good liberal arts course, to offer educational opportunity to students of limited financial means and uncertain educational goals. For this they do not need to cooperate with other similar institutions. Their greatest need is for close relations with local employers and with one or more senior colleges to whom their graduates are likely to transfer.

Cooperation is most useful for institutions of category II because they generally have an ambitious program of production and consumption functions, which require a variety of good quality offerings which are generally too costly for a single college of this type to provide for itself. Category IIB is especially needful of cooperation.

When one thinks of the autonomy in which the type II institutions gloried only a short time ago, one may suppose that cooperation among them is impossible. Founded often by religious denominations that mistrusted each other, rivals often for support by wealthy people in a community or for support by a state legislature, the small and medium-sized colleges stand as a monument to rugged individualism, and they stand in danger of becoming obsolete.

BASES OF COOPERATION

Probably a majority of type IIB institutions now belong to a cooperative association of some kind. They have discovered certain comfortable patterns of association.

One type of grouping uses a metropolitan area as a basis, or two or three contiguous areas. For instance, the Piedmont group includes colleges from the metropolitan areas of Charlotte, Winston-Salem and Greenville, North Carolina. The Richmond group (University Center in Virginia) and the Kansas City Regional Council on Higher Education extend out from the respective metropolitan centers. In this case there is a tendency to include all the higher institutions in the area, though a type III institution rarely joins.

Another type of grouping consists of eight or ten quite similar institutions situated in an area with a radius of 50 to 100 miles. The Mississippi Valley Association is an example. Here the emphasis is on similarity and the likelihood that all members of the group will want to participate in the same set of cooperative programs.

A grouping which focuses on one major problem is another type. Often the problem has a geographic location. For example, the West Philadelphia Corporation consists of five institutions all located in an area of Philadelphia that needed urban renewal. They have worked together to assist in urban renewal, and also to assist in the improvement of the public schools in their area.

State and regional organizations covering several states, have been practicing a limited cooperation for some time. A well known example is the Southern Regional Council.

PRINCIPLES OF SUCCESSFUL COOPERATION

Cooperation among colleges of category II must "pay" in terms of all three of the functions of higher education.

The production function can be strengthened by a number of cooperative activities. A Cooperative Research Council can help to secure research grants and to develop joint research programs, such as anthropological research expeditions. A University Press can be supported as a joint operation. Certain areas of scholarly specialization can be brought within reach of the colleges by sharing in the use of specialists on the faculty.

The opportunity function can be promoted by a systematic program of recruitment of poor but able students that could not be financed or justified in the budget of a single small institution.

One should remember that most type II colleges are small ones. There were 745 colleges and junior colleges with enrollments under 500 in 1964. More than half were type II colleges. Colleges under 1,000 make up 58 percent of all colleges, with only 11 percent of the nation's college enrollment. These colleges can retain the advantages of small size and still get some of the advantages of large size by mutual cooperation.

Above all, the consumption function is likely to be served better by cooperative arrangements that will enable colleges to take part in activities they have not had the resources for in the past. An adult education program covering a metropolitan area is an example, perhaps working through an adult education council. The development of a metropolitan area theater project with a school of dramatics might be financed by funds from the National Foundation for the Arts, if the colleges of the area could get together on it. Block booking of musical and dramatic programs is another possibility.

When the association is concentrated in and around a medium-sized metropolitan area, there might be a serious attempt to study the area, to identify the needs for cultural development, and to mount a program of cultural enrichment and community development.

The colleges of an area, if they worked seriously together on making a contribution to the social and material and spiritual needs of the area, might make their community the "School of __________" in the sense that Pericles intended when he said that Athens was the "School of Hellas."

TABLE 2

FACTS ABOUT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES RELATED TO METROPOLITAN AREAS

Size of SMSA	Percent of Total Population	Percent of Enrollment in Higher Education	Percent of Institutions Of Various Types			Coed	Male	Female	Private	Public
			I	II	III					
1,000,00+	34	32	22	29	36	25	31	33	36	17
500,000-1,000,000	11	13	8	8	12	9	13	13	11	7
250,000-500,000	9	9	7	10	10	9	10	10	10	7
100,000-250,000	8	12	7	10	10	10	12	13	9	9
50,000-100,000	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	2
Non-Metropolitan	37	33	54	42	31	45	33	30	33	58
Total Number		5,672,000 (1965)	660	811	687	1680	227	273	1387	791

Explanation of Types:

I. Junior Colleges and other less than 4-year institutions

II. Four Year Colleges

III. Universities, awarding M.A. and Ph.D. degree (the latter only in a minority of these institutions).

TABLE 3

FAMILY SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND EDUCATIONAL LEVELS OF YOUTH

(Estimates for 1970)

Social Class	Percent in Cohort of Youth	Percent of Class Graduating From High School	Percent of Cohort Graduating From H.S.	Percent of Class Entering Post-Secondary Education		Percent of Cohort Entering Post-Secondary Education		Percent of Class Graduating From College		Percent of Cohort Graduating From College	
				M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
A - Upper and Upper Middle	10	100	10	90	80	9	8	80	60	8	6
B - Lower Middle	30	90	27	67	50	20	15	40	27	12	8
C - Upper Working Class	40	70	28	40	25	16	10	15	9	6	3.6
D - Lower Working Class	20	40	8	10	5	2	1	5	2	1	0.4
	100		73			47	34			27	18

TABLE 4

MENTAL ABILITY AND COLLEGE ENTRANCE

(Estimates for 1970)

Quartile of Mental Ability	Percent Who Enter College	
	M	F
I (high)	22	18
II	17	11
III	6	4
IV	2	1
	47	34

PERSPECTIVES ON THE FUTURE

In this final chapter, we have been given a brief preview of what lies ahead in higher education. In the immediate future, a growing college population will demand an education that is relevant to the needs of an increasingly complex world. Higher education must grow, too, to meet this challenge.

The traditional liberal arts college is already obsolete, according to Morris Keeton. The liberal arts college of tomorrow must provide a setting in the context of tomorrow for "the competent probing in idea and act into the nature and possibilities of men and society." Part of that setting will include an educational network linking institutions. Individual colleges and universities can tap this network for educational benefits and still provide a more intimate campus environment for their own students.

The chief beneficiaries of interinstitutional cooperation will be the four and five-year institutions that award most of the bachelor's, and a majority of the master's, degrees. Cooperative ventures will enable these institutions to provide the great variety of educational offerings that students of the future will require. Thus, Title III reinforces excellence in education, and, as Robert J. Havighurst noted, "it seems to have come just when it could do the most good."

Underlying the conference was agreement on the need for better planning in cooperative undertakings. During discussion periods, participants proposed ways to improve both the planning techniques and the selection of developing colleges for Title III projects.

PERSPECTIVES ON PLANNING IN INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

Advanced Planning Necessary

> One of the major problems confronting Title III is that money for planning has to be related to an action program--and one that is already underway at the time of spending. There are no funds for advanced planning. Such funds are needed because institutions have to have a chance to work together before a program can start.

Status Quo May Be Favored

> Most of the stop-gap basis aid will make it easier for grantee colleges to continue doing "business as usual," the very last prescription imaginable for many developing institutions. As one observer noted, Title III could mean using "dollars to bind schools to their own images."

Planning Funds Requested

> We have already asked for new legislation which would make funds available for advanced planning. We do recognize that there will remain a need for long range planning beyond the needs of a specific grant. We are hoping that funds for this purpose will be available from private foundations . . . should not this conference be saying that here is an area where foundations and government might well come together? The foundations might provide the

planning money, and then the government could go on with the implementation.

Planning Procedure Outlined

This long range planning should involve the faculty, or their representatives, and the administration. Under some kind of discussion leadership, these groups should sit down to think through what the real role of the institution is and should be, what changes should be occurring, and what resources are available or can be projected to accomplish the goals. In the end, they can come up with a long range plan which should be kept quite flexible. The main thing is to have the group that is going to be involved in the process of development thinking through for themselves just what they plan to do. In effect, a self-study often is a re-educational process.

Self-Study Stirs Dialogue

The self-study is not merely to get a better plan. It is essentially a device to stimulate dialogue within the institution to create a ferment that will enable the institution to do something. There are two kinds of self-study. In the first, an institution invites an expert in to make a survey and write a report. Often this is not a particularly valuable technique because the report goes on a shelf. A more valuable self-study involves a re-education of the institution itself. It is an occasion to involve the people of the institution in a self-analysis, utilizing data that have been collected and involving subcommittees on many kinds of topics.

Developing Must Help Themselves

In helping developing colleges, the first thing is to help them to help themselves. New attitudes and ideas must be generated so that a fresh breeze blows into the institution. You can't do this in a paternalistic way or by extending the carrot of financial aid. You've got to carry this institution through a process of re-thinking,a re-education in relation to what they can do for themselves.

Better Management Needed

These schools don't plan because they don't have time, partly because the people involved are doing things they have no business doing. The president may insist on personally overseeing the hiring of all teachers or a dean may check every department proposal. One partial solution would be to get these administrators to try to understand what management is.

Executive Discretion Crucial

One recognized barrier for many developing institutions revolves around the autocratic role of the president, who may not have learned how to delegate responsibility. The failure to insist that all Title III grants be organic parts of long range plans further heightens the ability of a given president to pick favorites on a year-to-year basis, rewarding such favorites with handsome sinecures.

Student Benefit Is Central

A central concern in planning is that somewhere along the line students get something better. Any plan would have to be justified, not so much on institutional survival, but on its benefit for the student. This will create difficulties since it is almost impossible to set up absolute criteria to measure in advance what a student will learn from a given program.

Relationship Is Sensitive

In providing funds for a developing college, the government acts as a donor. The resulting relationship between the government and the grantee is that of a consultant to a client. Very quickly the "clients" learn which side their bread is buttered on and to do the kinds of planning and reports that will get funds.

Separate Functions Proposed

One solution would be to have the proposal writers and report writers interacting with the government. Then they could scrounge money for the creative people. If you're going to develop anything, by definition no committee is going to agree to it.

Creativity Is Threatened

I have been impressed in visiting smaller, less well known colleges, and occasionally running across programs that are usually self-administered, autonomous, anonymously funded, but remarkable for their ingenuity and brilliance. Usually they stem from a single school or very small committee. Local pride develops. When they reach the point where they seek funds from foundations or the government, the result is to kill the creativity of the project . . . Usually the things really needed to give a program an aura of excitement are not easily tailored to program guidelines. For developing colleges, the individual circumstances so determine what goes into an effective program that the granting agencies must come to trust that they know what they want and to let them spend the money the way they want.

Consider Study of Working Programs

Would this mutuality be likely to come about if Title III gave money for some kind of participational self-study? This study could be made after the relationship has been developed, between the first and second years of the grant, after the institutions got going and weren't quite so insecure. . .This sense of security in sharing information and revealing and discussing each other's problem is essential in various kinds of institutional studies. You have to create this atmosphere first.

Developing Need Guidance

The developing institution, whether it's Podunk College in Indiana or a Negro institution in the South, doesn't have the resources for planning. The concept itself may not have occurred. Thus, some initial planning opportunity is needed.

Goals Must Be Clear

The first step in initiating cooperation is for the developing institution to recognize its weaknesses. Administrators, faculty, and students should get together to consider what they are supposed to be doing. They should agree on their goals and find out which of the goals are not being reached fast enough. Once the deficiency is apparent, they can implement their program....For example, a school may discover that its medical offerings are weak. Perhaps it can improve its laboratory or equipment or combine with another school so that both institutions can have a better biology department. As soon as the specific goals are agreed upon, the institutions can plan to reach these goals intelligently.

Examine Established Resources

The list of things that can be done via cooperation presupposes the developing institution has gone through a careful self-analysis and assessed what its future involves. The self-analysis should help determine the specific direction toward which the institution should move in order to follow through on what it wants to do and is not now doing well. The other side of the coin is that cooperation also presupposes that the developing have examined the established to determine if they have the resources that meet their needs.

a

Pay-Off Is Essential

No cooperative effort will be successful unless there is pay-off for all concerned, either immediate or eventual. If there is no pay-off, the established institution will get out of the relationship. It also must be recognized that there is a wide time span in which this pay-off might come.

Relationship Not Permanent

It must also be recognized that the time will come when it is necessary to cut off the cooperative relationship. Title III administrators must be alert to this as they refund year by year. . . . An institution must retain the capacity to break off the relationship without any loss of self-esteem. Eventually a time for breaking off will come.

Is Permanence Possible?

Perhaps some of these cooperative ventures could pay off permanently--maybe cooperation is not such a stop-gap idea after all. Is it not possible that certain kinds of multiple cooperatives could operate on a permanent basis? This is especially true where cooperatives have a geographic focus of some kind. Are you not just building a type of multiversity in an area rather than on a single campus? This multiversity is made out of a number of separate institutions to compensate for the lack of resources they present individually.

Programs Will Sustain Themselves

When the pay-off starts coming to one of the institutions, the government assistance can gradually come to a halt. The cooperative involvement will take care of itself; it will be self-perpetuating.

Planning Points Summarized

In summary, the developing institutions should: re-establish or reaffirm their own goals; determine the weaknesses that prevent them from reaching these goals; examine others and see where they might help; develop a long range plan for using this help; consider the students' and institutions' vitality; recognize that there must be mutual pay-off, and be willing to have a depth relationship with at least one other institution for a period of time.

PERSPECTIVES ON CRITERIA FOR SELECTING THE DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

Criteria Must Be Relevant

The usual quality ratings made in higher education should not be used. Nor should the Office of Education utilize the factors that have been employed in such studies. In contrast to these academic factors, we should advance criteria that are more meaningful for the small developing colleges. These might include: the number of graduates who are elected to community office, their measurable philanthropy, or the rationality with which they control their reproductive behavior, community earnings, and community contributions. This is a radically different and more relevant set of criteria.

Basic Criterion Is Impact

One of the functions of a liberal arts education is to free the individual from the limitations of his social class origin, his national and regional origins, and his disciplinary specialization. You have to learn how to apply the criterion by asking: how did the student arrive, how far did he get, what are the directions of "being free" from provincialisms? But your standards arise out of this as your ultimate criterion is impact--what is the impact of the institution relative to its purpose and to the student's starting position?

Set Up Minimum Standards

This concept of impact may be educationally or sociologically sound but has potential political drawbacks. It helps little in making the awkward choices that must be made. It might be better to establish a nucleus of basic minimum requirements that one could look for in the so-called developing college. With these requirements in mind, one could see if a given college was at the beginning, half-way or three quarters along toward take-off, which would involve the capacity of sustaining momentum in either its fiscal or educational capacities. That's what a professional should be looking for--characteristics that make it both economically viable and educationally sound.

Consider Environmental Pattern

Beyond institutional characteristics and the dynamics of a college, attention should be given to the ecological characteristics of academic institutions. Any assessment of capacity to develop should take these considerations into account. Many of these colleges may be in psychologically hostile or unresponsive environments. If you are trying to develop a school, particularly to expand its research program, you need the cooperation of nearby business and industry.

Quality Excludes Some Students

Too often when an institution moves up to quality, it turns away whole categories of students in the process. This is of special significance for the predominantly Negro institutions. All of us are striving for quality on the traditional ladder, but the bulk of our students are not on this track. The effect is that we are leaving behind many excellent minds. Our upward mobility goals, in effect, take us out of reach of many of the students we should be serving. But then we have the dilemma that if we continue to serve the students who most need us,

> we have problems in being funded or even in gaining accreditation. We should be open to a variety of students and we should channel them to the institutions most appropriate for them. To some extend, Jarvis Christian understood this kind of role. If Jarvis Christian could get a grant--which would imply that some foundation respects what it is doing--this would be an important assist. This happened at Miles to some degree; the college's very problems pushed it into the press and led to a certain kind of prestige. It's not academic prestige but a unique status resulting from the knowledge that 90 percent of the students at Miles are there because they have no other opportunity. Some well meaning people want to expand these opportunities. In the process, some promising students have been "discovered," but others even more promising have been missed because the measuring stick was inappropriate.
>
> ### Continue Service to Students
>
> The developing institutions should continue to serve the kinds of students they are now serving and still be considered part of the academic community. It is the threat of exclusion from the academic community that pushes everybody in the same direction. In the present system, one cannot recognize this kind of difference among institutions.

From the above exchanges, it is obvious that improved planning is basic to the success of Title III programs. Hopefully, government funds will be made available for the long range analysis that is so vital to the success of interinstitutional cooperation. In the meantime, the private foundations might be approached for the needed funds. It is essential that the developing schools approach cooperative relationships with clear-cut aims in mind, guided by an understanding of their own weaknesses and needs.

In selecting developing schools for Title III programs, a relevant set of criteria must be used. Attention should be paid to the college's setting and to the kinds of students it serves. In moving up toward quality education, the college must be careful not to leave behind the students most in need of help. In serving these students--who are not usually among the academically elite--the developing schools should have the support of the academic community.

VII RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS

As the conference drew to a close, participants turned their attention to ways in which Title III programs could be improved. The resulting recommendations reflected not only a spectrum of viewpoints but also the consensus that interinstitutional cooperation has proved a major factor in the higher education of today--and tomorrow.

As forerunners of this cooperative trend, the initial Title III exchanges take on a significance beyond their limited scope. Despite shortcomings and even some failures, the 84 projects offer proof that interinstitutional cooperation can work. Although the Title III activities were concentrated mainly on exchanges between advanced and developing institutions, much of what was learned can be applied more generally. The foregoing papers by educators, administrators, government and foundation representatives, and others involved in these programs provide a perspective on interinstitutional cooperation with its challenging, and creative, possibilities.

The American ideal of equal educational opportunities for all young people is closer to fulfillment through Title III. The Title is designed not only to give financial aid to institutions traditionally denied such help but also to draw these schools into the educational mainstream. Cooperation between advanced and developing institutions is the key to such achievement; but cooperation must be more than a bootstrap operation.

For interinstitutional cooperation to be effective, mutual respect and reciprocal enrichment are essential.

Fortunately, the open, uncoordinated structure of American universities provides an agreeable climate for cooperative programs. Interdependence is further advanced by the demands made by an increasingly complex world. Competition has given way to cooperation as institutions unite to cut costs, serve geographic regions, and upgrade educational quality. In this atmosphere, the electronic media are connective links, shattering the barriers of time and space to permit institutions to share instruction and resources.

In the long run, student benefit determines the success of any cooperative program. Special attention must be given to the needs of today's students who are generally offered an education that has little relevance to the world they know. Programs that foster human commitment and preserve students' self-esteem should be central. The Negro student, especially, must be made aware of his own worth and dignity, instead of being asked to conform to white middle class standards. Recognizing that students learn in different ways, institutions should build on what students already know. Negro students who are often ill-prepared for college work should be helped to remain in school once they have passed the hurdle of college entrance. Integration itself can be advanced through cooperative programs. Creative exchanges between northern institutions and predominantly Negro colleges in the South can serve as laboratories of integration and demonstrate what a truly "great society" can be.

Interinstitutional cooperation looms large in the higher education of the future. In the next decades, it is almost certain that an educational network will be formed, permitting institutions to draw from a huge pool of resources which individual schools could not duplicate alone. What form this network will take is still uncertain, but it is logical that educators will look to the Title III programs for guidance and examples. Therefore, the following recommendations for improved Title III performance offers insights into the future of interinstitutional cooperation.

> "It would be an unsound fancy and self-contradictory to expect that things which have never yet been done can be done except by means which have never yet been tried."
>
> Sir Francis Bacon

INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PUBLIC POLICY

1. Title III grants should be made to developing colleges to make possible better proposals for subsequent requests.

2. The Zacharias - Nabrit - White proposal of a single consortium made up of a large group of major northern universities linked to all of the Negro colleges in the South should be reviewed and given serious consideration.

3. Since student exchanges are among the most beneficial patterns of interinstitutional cooperation they should be vigorously promoted through Title III grants.

4. The Title III advisory council should consist of people of independent standing and experience and they should assume a larger policy role. The number of panelists evaluating Title III proposals should be expanded. These panelists should meet for longer periods of time and make on-site visits to the applicant institutions when possible. The Title III office should avoid even the appearance that it is the major source of Title III policies. A system of rotating Title III staff appointments, experienced people on limited leaves of absence from foundations and universities, should be inaugurated to provide additional expertise in the administration of the program.

5. Title III grants should be explicitly related to grants under other titles of the Higher Education Act.

6. Since a number of small grants may be necessary for political reasons, these grants should be made for planning and self-study. Large grants should be restricted to those institutions and projects that have the potential to make significant contributions to the education of students.

7. Negotiation of Title III grants should be patterned after that of the National Science Foundation improvement program with no fixed deadlines so that better use could be made of funds.

8. Title III should be expanded to permit grants to non-academic institutions, especially to professional societies, and to permit college-industry, college-school, and college-community modes of interinstitutional cooperation.

9. In allocating grants, proposals which hold high promise of increasing organizational capacity for survival should be emphasized. Standards of eligibility should be developed that will make it possible to deny grants to weak colleges that do not seem to have the capacity to survive.

10. Each applicant institution should be asked to accompany its Title III proposal with a formal long range development projection. Investments in future improvement rather than current consumption should be stressed, since long range effect depends chiefly on the investment input. Grants given must not be aimed at shoring up individual departments, but should be organic parts of long range plans which evidence "desire and potential."

11. Grants should be made to other than developing institutions when these grants promise greater benefits for the developing institutions than would direct grants.

12. The National Teaching Fellowship program should be administered separately from Title III and set up as a national recruiting operation to channel first-rate graduate students and young teachers to institutions which need them. Their major role should be to fill the places of teachers going away for graduate study.

13. The Office of Education should encourage innovative programs. Major experimental resource development efforts are required to develop new curricula and resources.

14. The predominately Negro colleges should be given a high priority in Title III assessments both because of the isolation these colleges face and because of the great promise they offer.

15. Greater emphasis must be placed upon gaining information about the functions of interinstitutional cooperation, which will lead to restructuring for higher education and its redirection toward greater public responsibility.

16. A national clearinghouse and consultative service should be set up and financed to cross-fertilize the new ideas, methods, programs, and projects developed in cooperative programs.

17. More funds are needed for aid to developing colleges. Title III's $30 million is too small an amount with which to approach this major national problem.

INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION AND ESTABLISHED INSTITUTIONS

1. Cooperative programs should be planned carefully to insure the best possible adjustment of exchangees (students, teachers, and administrators) of the developing colleges at established institutions and vice versa.

2. The established college exchange should be geared to the norms of the developing institutions.

3. Established institutions should consider the special needs of the developing colleges for new courses, training teachers, and learning materials.

4. Established institutions must avoid any appearance of condescension or superiority in their relationships with developing institutions.

5. Established institutions must recognize the uniqueness of developing institutions and value the contributions these schools can make.

6. Established institutions must experience some benefit or pay-off from the exchange programs. If they carefully assess their involvement they will discover the investment pays measurable dividends.

7. Established institutions should be enabled to demonstrate to developing colleges how to effectively utilize modern electronic media of communication.

8. Established institutions should recognize the differences in quality represented by developing colleges, rather than generalizing that all these schools are in some "poor" category.

9. The established institutions should take the lead in promoting social change by becoming laboratories of integration.

10. To assure integrated graduate education, regular post-baccalaureate assessment and remedial programs should be set up in

conjunction with greater use of conditional admission policies, along with programs to assure expanding job opportunities for Negro graduates.

11. Established universities should establish joint research projects with developing institutions, with high priority given to study of the ways in which higher education itself can move ahead toward achieving the goal of universal higher education.

12. Established institutions should apply more of their resources toward helping the ill-prepared students succeed in college. Special counselling services, financial aid, and a favorable social atmosphere are particularly important.

INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION AND DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

1. The premise of one-to-one relationships should be reexamined and possibly modified as the major premise of aid to developing colleges.

2. Multi-lateral structures, perhaps along disciplinary lines, should be developed to link strong university programs to the needs of developing colleges.

3. The developing institutions should undergo self-studies to establish or reaffirm their goals and to determine their strength and weaknesses in reaching their goals.

4. Seminars for administrators from developing colleges should be provided, conducted by successful administrators from other institutions.

5. The developing institutions must examine other institutions to see how cooperative programs could help to overcome revealed weaknesses.

6. Institutions must allow for periodic reevaluations and be prepared to break off cooperation when best for those concerned.

7. The developing institutions must recognize the need for change and be receptive to the help offered by established institutions.

8. The developing institutions must maintain their own integrity, not become slavish imitations of the assisting schools.

9. A computer consortia should be considered as a possible means of strengthening developing institutions.

INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION AND THE NEGRO COLLEGES

1. Ways must be found to channel many more resources to the Negro colleges as a group. One way might be to adopt as Title III policy to concentrate on those schools which offer the sole source of higher educational opportunity to their student population. This would lead to the Negro colleges being the principal beneficiaries.

2. The goal of upgrading the academic quality of Negro institutions should mean primarily benefits for students transmitted as directly as possible.

3. Long range programs and contacts of all sorts between Negro colleges and northern institutions should be increased.

4. Public institutions for Negroes in the South should be encouraged to form constructive relationships with business, industry, and professional organizations. Colleges should be tuned to the needs of business, industry, and the professions in order to offer more courses in these new areas of employment opportunity.

5. Negro students who are subjected to de facto segregation, should be given intensive pre-college training, with special summer institutes offered for teachers involved in this training.

6. Title III priority should be given to programs relating to the first year of education at developing colleges, particularly at the predominantly Negro colleges.

7. A body of learning aids should be prepared, at the level of the Negro secondary school graduate, dealing with communications, the humanities, mathematics, and inquiry.

8. Faculty members at Negro colleges should be provided with opportunities for advanced study, while qualified graduates of the better graduate schools should be encouraged to join the faculties of these schools.

9. Recognizing that Negro colleges have a unique role to play in American education, the Title III office should concentrate innovative programs at these schools.

INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION AND QUALITY PROBLEMS

1. Studies of the temporal dynamics of assessed institutional strengths should be undertaken, along with supplemental studies of the ecology of developing institutions.

2. Support should be stressed for work by administrators on a re-definition of purpose and on the main strategies of achieving significant change in the college, possibly by small regional workshops under USOE management or by sub-contract.

3. Consideration should be given to methods of operations analysis, cybernetics and systems engineering to improve the level of service performed and reduce costs of operation.

4. Quantitative criteria for the evaluation of the level of achievement reached by institutions in obtaining specified goals should be developed.

5. Descriptions of successful cooperative programs should be prepared for the guidance of institutions engaged in similar enterprises.

6. Site visitations by qualified professionals to the campuses prior to grant approval, and periodic check ups thereafter, should be required.

7. Curriculum innovation should be developed to allow more student initiative and responsibility in the conduct of study and to encourage students to be of help and service to others.

8. Evidence of commitment and mutual respect should be required of institutions entering cooperative programs. To assure long range commitment and survival, partners in cooperative enterprises must be selected carefully.

9. Alternatives to faculty exchange programs should be considered, particularly classroom connective devices such as telephonic connections and video-taped sequences of courses.

The spirit of the Wingspread conference, hopefully recaptured in this book, was one of optimism and faith in the concept of interinstitutional cooperation. Underlying all the specific recommendations listed above was agreement on the need for cooperative exchanges. At their worst, these programs can provide stop-gap help in immediate situations; at their best, they can start a developing institution on the path to making "a substantial contribution to the higher education resources of our Nation."

APPENDIX A

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

TITLE III - STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

Statement of Purpose and Appropriations Authorized

Sec. 301.

(a) The purpose of this title is to assist in raising the academic quality of colleges which have the desire and potential to make a substantial contribution to the higher education resources of our Nation but which for financial and other reasons are struggling for survival and are isolated from the main currents of academic life, and to do so by enabling the Commissioner to establish a national teaching fellow program and to encourage and assist in the establishment of cooperative arrangements under which these colleges may draw on the talent and experience of our finest colleges and universities, and on the educational resources of business and industry, in their effort to improve their academic quality.

(b) (1) There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $55,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, to carry out the provisions of this title.

(2) Of the sums appropriated pursuant to this section for any fiscal year, 78 per centum shall be available only for carrying out the provisions of this title with respect to developing institutions which plan to award one or more bachelor's degrees during such year.

(3) The remainder of the sums so appropriated shall be available only for carrying out the provisions of this title with respect to developing institutions which do not plan to award such a degree during such year.

Definition of "Developing Institution"

Sec. 302. As used in this title the term "developing institution" means a public or nonprofit educational institution in any State which--

(a) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a secondary school, or the recognized equivalent of such certificate;

(b) is legally authorized to provide, and provides within the State, an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, or offers a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or other technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles of knowledge;

(c) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association determined by the Commissioner to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered or is, according to such an agency or association, making reasonable progress toward accreditation;

(d) has met the requirements of clauses (a) and (b) during the five academic years preceding the academic year for which it seeks assistance under this title;

(e) is making a reasonable effort to improve the quality of its teaching and administrative staffs and of its student services;

(f) is, for financial or other reasons, struggling for survival and is isolated from the main currents of academic life;

(g) meets such other requirements as the Commissioner may prescribe by regulation; and

(h) is not an institution, or department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

Advisory Council on Developing Institutions

Sec. 303.

(a) The Commissioner shall establish in the Office of Education an

Advisory Council on Developing Institutions (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Council"), consisting of the Commissioner who shall be Chairman, one representative each of such Federal agencies having responsibilities with respect to developing institutions as the Commissioner may designate, and eight members appointed, without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

(b) The Council shall advise the Commissioner with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this title and in particular shall assist the Commissioner in identifying those developing institutions through which the purposes of this title can best be achieved and in establishing priorities for use in approving applications under this title. The Commissioner may appoint such special advisory and technical experts and consultants as may be useful in carrying out the functions of the Council.

(c) Members of the Council who are not otherwise full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Council, receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, members may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U. S. C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Grants for Cooperative Agreements to Strengthen Developing Institutions

Sec. 304.

(a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to developing institutions and other colleges and universities to pay part of the cost of planning, developing, and carrying out cooperative arrangements which show promise as effective measures for strengthening the academic programs and the administration of developing institutions. Such cooperative arrangements may be between developing institutions, between developing institutions and other colleges and universities, and between developing institutions and organizations, agencies, and business entities. Grants under this section may be used for projects and activities such as--

(1) exchange of faculty or students, including arrangements for bringing visiting scholars to developing institutions;

(2) faculty and administration improvement programs utilizing training, education (including fellowships leading to advanced degrees), internships, research participation, and other means;

(3) introduction of new curriculums and curricular materials;

(4) development and operation of cooperative education programs involving alternate periods of academic study and business or public employment;

(5) joint use of facilities such as libraries or laboratories, including necessary books, materials, and equipment; and

(6) other arrangements which offer promise of strengthening the academic programs and the administration of developing institutions.

(b) A grant may be made under this section only upon application to the Commissioner at such time or times and containing such information as he deems necessary. The Commissioner shall not approve an application unless it--

(1) sets forth a program for carrying out one or more projects or activities which meet the requirements of subsection (a) and provides for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the program;

(2) sets forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this section for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available for purposes which meet the requirements of subsection (a), and in no case supplant such funds;

(3) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this section; and

(4) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may require to carry out his functions under this title, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(c) The Commissioner shall, after consultation with the Council, establish criteria as to eligible expenditures for which grants made under this section may be used, which criteria shall be so designed as to prevent the use of such grants for expenditures not necessary to the achievement of the purposes of this title.

National Teaching Fellowships

Sec. 305.

(a) The Commissioner is authorized to award fellowships under this section to highly qualified graduate students and junior members of the faculty of colleges and universities, to encourage such individuals to teach at developing institutions. The Commissioner shall award fellowships to individuals for teaching at developing institutions only upon application by an institution approved for this purpose by the Commissioner and only upon a finding by the Commissioner that the program of teaching set forth in the application is reasonable in the light of the qualifications of the teaching fellow and of the educational needs of the applicant.

(b) Fellowships may be awarded under this section for such period of teaching as the Commissioner may determine, but such period shall not exceed two academic years. Each person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this section shall receive a stipend for each academic year of teaching of not more than $6,500 as determine by the Commissioner upon the advice of the Council, plus an additional amount of $400 for each year on account of each of his dependents.

PARTICIPANTS AND CONTRIBUTORS

ROBERT O. BERDAHL
Director, Study of Statewide Systems of Higher Education
American Council on Education

C. M. CHARLES
Professor of Education
San Diego State College

H. MILLARD CLEMENTS
Lecturer, Curriculum and Instruction
The University of Wisconsin

HOWARD CONANT
Chairman, Department of Art Education
Head, Division of Creative Arts
Chairman of the New York University Art Collection
New York University

EDWARD W. CROSBY
Director of Curriculum and Teacher-Counselors
Southern Illinois University

FRED E. CROSSLAND
Program Officer
The Ford Foundation

MERRIMON CUNINGGIM
President
The Danforth Foundation

FRAMPTON DAVIS
Staff Consultant, Institute of Human Relations
The University of Wisconsin

JAMES I. DOI
Professor of Higher Education
The University of Michigan

HUGH GLOSTER
Dean of Faculty
Hampton Institute

GARY GUMPERT
Director, Instructional Television Development and Utilization
The University of Wisconsin

VERNON F. HAUBRICH
Professor of Educational Policy
The University of Wisconsin

ROBERT J. HAVIGHURST
Professor of Education and Human Development
The University of Chicago

ALGO D. HENDERSON
Center for Research and Development in Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley

HARLAN HOFFA
Art Education Specialist
United States Office of Education

MICHAEL J. HOROWITZ
Associate Professor of Law
University of Mississippi

LAWRENCE C. HOWARD
Director, Institute of Human Relations
The University of Wisconsin

DANIEL KATZ
Professor of Psychology
The University of Michigan

JOSEPH KATZ
Associate Director, Institute for the Study of Human Problems
Stanford University

MORRIS KEETON
Academic Vice President
Antioch College

MARC LEE
The University of Wisconsin

THEODORE J. MARCHESE, JR.
Center for the Study of Higher Education
The University of Michigan

ROBERT MCGINNIS
Professor of Mathematic Sociology
Cornell University

JAMES C. MESSERSMITH
Consultant in Higher Education
United States Office of Education

RAYMOND S. MOORE
Consultant in Higher Education
United States Office of Education

SAMUEL M. NABRIT
President
Texas Southern University

LESLIE PAFFRATH
President
The Johnson Foundation

CECIL L. PATTERSON
Chairman, Wisconsin Liaison Committee
North Carolina College

LUCIUS H. PITTS
President
Miles College

WILLA B. PLAYER
Director, Division of College Support
Bureau of Higher Education
United States Office of Education

ARNOLD REISMAN
Visiting Professor of Engineering and
The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

ARTHUR SINGER
President
Educational Development Center

CHARLES W. SLACK
Educational Consultant
Montclair, New Jersey

ARTHUR D. SULLIVAN
Consultant in Higher Education
Takoma Park, Maryland

CHARLES VEVIER
Vice Chancellor
The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

STEPHEN WHITE
Educational Services Incorporated

JERROLD R. ZACHARIAS
Professor of Physics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

REACTIONS

In order for this publication Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education, to better serve the needs of colleges and universities throughout the nation, reader reaction is herewith being sought. The following questions are asked.

1. We would like to have your suggestions regarding the content and format of this publication.

2. Does the material in this study reflect and relate to your circumstances?

3. Can you suggest specific interinstitutional cooperative experiences which would add significantly to this study?

4. What problems related to this subject should be given the highest priority, in terms of further research?

5. To what uses can this study be put, if any? What suggestions do you have for colleges and universities interested in interinstitutional arrangements?

6. A critical concern for colleges is how to increase the levels of academic quality. How can this be accomplished through interinstitutional cooperation? What measure would you suggest as evidence of a rise in academic quality?

7. What can the United States Office of Education and the Foundations do to encourage or facilitate beneficial institutional arrangements?

Kindly address reactions to:

Dr. Winslow R. Hatch
Bureau of Higher Education Research
Office of Education
U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D.C. 20202